melbourne anarchist archives

DEVELOPMENT OF MELBOURNE ANARCHISM

DRAFTS, DOCUMENTS & ARTICLES
1966 - 1973

ANARCHIST PAPERS 1

INTRODUCTION

This collection of Melbourne Anarchist documents for the period 1966-73 is the first in a series of papers we hope to produce on the history of Australian Anarchism. The object of such a series of publications is not simply that of contributing to the historiography of the Australian left but is rather that of contributing towards the development of the present movement by the critical study of its past. Indeed even to exhibit such a past is to contribute towards the unification of the present movement for many anarchist individuals in Australia are unaware that they form part of a tradition. By identifying this tradition - or strictly those traditions since several streams have come together in the current movement - we give the atomised individuals something to relate to; by criticising this tradition we can do something towards ensuring that our past is behind us.

Both these aspects are important if Australian anarchism is to develop. In the absence of a living tradition to relate to, groups come into existence and die away without there being any overall development in the movement and people enter the movement and develop theoretically and practically within it as individuals without the movement as a whole developing with them. The development of individuals within the movement is thus a prerequisite of the development of the movement but is not identical with it. The development of the movement requires that individual development takes place publicly and is communicated. Communication between individuals and groups separated in space can be facilitated through conferences, interstate visits and internal bulletins; communication between those separated in time can only be done through the study and criticism of our history.

Because as wide a circle as possible - ideally the whole movement - should take part in this critical study it has seemed desirable to publish collections of documents and memoirs of participants where possible rather than imposing upon the reader a finished historical essay with analysis and conclusion but with no data for the reader to arrive at an independent judgement. Some such essays may be published on the early movement but where possible the more recent groups will be treated through the publication of archival material.

The present publication does not provide a complete picture of Melbourne Anarchism in the 1966-73 period since - leaving aside its omission of the Spanish and Italian migrant groups - it is almost entirely confined to what may be called the Melbourne/ La Trobe current. This current which started with the group TREASON at Melbourne University in 1966 included the Melbourne Anarchist League and "Black Rag" Group as well as La Trobe Anarchists; the other current which started with the "Solidarity" group in 1969 included the magazines "Assassin" and "Outlaw" and ended with the Working Peoples Association and Free Store in 1973.

Although the original intention was that this publication would cover Melbourne Anarchism generally the selection principles used - a restriction to original theoretical and political statements or illustrative journalism retaining a political or historical interest - led to nearly all the available material from the "Solidarity"/ Free Store current being excluded. As a result it was decided to prepare a second study based on memoirs to deal with this current and to print illustrative documents in an appendix to it. (The most important of these is the manifesto of the Anarcho-Surrealist Insurrectionary Feminists which was one of the two fragments formed by the disintegration of the Free Store Group.) When this has been done a much better picture of Melbourne anarchist activity will emerge; for the moment the current document will serve to illustrate the pre-history of the ideas that went into the FAA organisational document and La Trobe issues of the FAA bulletin.

In presenting the essays and documents below it need hardly be pointed out that not all of them are equally good or well-written. Despite this we believe that there is a development which transcends the ageing of particular individuals and that the tradition exhibited in them is a valuable one worthy of critical study and further development.

Melbourne Anarchist Archives.

N.B. Whilst most of the articles were published in newspapers, newsheets or pamphlets some are drafts which were not completed or not intended for publication.

CONTENTS

1966

Constitution: The Revolutionary Emancipists Against State Oppression and Nationalism. P. 1

Australian-New Zealand Anarchist Congress P. 2

The State and Politics: some definitions * P. 3

General Schema for the Development of the Managerial Corporative State * P. 3

The State * P. 4

The Ideology of the Managed Society * P. 5

On Classes * P. 6

The Anarchist Programme: Some Notes * P. 8

Two Roads Forward: Right and Left Cyberneticism: An Anarchist Programme * P. 9

State, Society and Individual * P. 15

Student Action for Education P. 18

Education for Freedom * P. 19

The Modern State * P. 21

1967

Modern Approaches to Anarchism * P. 22

The Relevance of Anarchism P. 23

Anarcho-Reformism: The 20th Century and After * P. 24

Against Student Turns P. 25

Conscription P. 26

On the Famous Debate: Socialism in Australia P. 26

Marx, Sorel and the Nordic Worldview (Tolkienic Anarchism) P. 27

Duncan Dundonald, Scottish Syndicalist and the Quintessence of Anarchism (an elaborate spoof) P. 27

Information Sheet of The Revolutionary Emancipists Against State Oppression and Nationalism (TREASON) P. 29

1968

What is the Anarchist Position? * P. 31

A Short History of TREASON P. 33

Ho For The Merry Month of May! P. 34

Czechoslovakia P. 35

1969

On The Right of Certain Comrades to Carry Red-and-Black Flags P. 36

High Strikes! P. 37

On the N.L.F.: Those Ten Points P. 37

On Workers Control 1 * P. 38

The Quintessence of Bureaucracy P. 39

On the Correct Handling of Defence Department Recruiters P. 40

Plain Anarchism, Marxist Anarchism and Anarchist Marxism:

Part 1 Bakunin and Marx P. 41
Part 2 Anarchism and Social Democracy 1871-1914 * P. 42

Styles P. 44

1970

To Secondary Students P. 45

On Workers Control 2 * P. 46

Notes on Militant Action * P. 47

May's Anarchic Days (carnival anarchism) P. 49

Pre-Moratorium Leaflet (carnival anarchism) P. 49

The Growth of the Australian Anarchist Movement P. 50

Documents of the "Save the Lemmings" Campaign (carnival anarchism)

a. The Thoroughly Worthwhile Cause of Lemming Aid P. 53
b. Raise High the Banner of Marxist-Lemmingist Thought P. 54
c. Marxist-Lemmingists on the Road to Power P. 55
d. A Participant Report * P. 55

Empty Victory P. 56

Police, State and Students P. 56

A Pleasant Saturday Morning...in the Streets of Melbourne P. 57

Towards an Anarchist Festival of Arts: A Call to An Anarchist Conference P. 58

1971

Report of the Orientation Handbook Editors P. 60

Fighting on Two Fronts: Against the University Administration; Against the Student Maoists.

a. One mistake...before another P. 61
b. What is to be done? To whom? P. 63
c. What is to be undone. P. 64

Intelligent and Unintelligent Strategy: Right, Left and Centre On the Eve of an Occupation * P. 65

Tactics in the Struggle Against the Admissions Regulation * P. 67

Student Newspaper Editorial P. 67

Notes on Anarchism P. 67

Idealism Dies P. 71

Marxist Economics and the Spectacular Economy: Introduction to "Time and Labour" from Guy Debord Society of the Spectacle P. 72

Be an Alien P. 73

The University as Production and Consumption P. 73

Anarchism and History P. 77

1972

From a May Day Newspaper P. 79

Anarchism Against Maoism P. 81

The Possitivity of Anarchism P. 82

The Re-Emergence of Obsolete Communism P. 83

Community Action - Self-Management Conference P. 85

1973: What is to be done? P. 85

Workers Control or Self-Management P. 86

1973

Student Activism: A Return to the Mid-Sixties? P. 87

* Draft article not originally published or not originally intended for publication.

CONSTITUTION: THE REVOLUTIONARY EMANCIPISTS AGAINST STATE OPPRESSION AND NATIONALISM (1966)

(TREASON was formed in May 1966 by members of Melbourne University Campaign Against Conscription, Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament and Abschol. After 1970 it became known as the Melbourne University Anarchists).

1. NAME:

As above; accepted abbreviation "T.R.E.A.S.O.N."

2. AIMS:

To provide a forum for Pacifist, Anarchist and Libertarian opinions; to spread these by propaganda and action.

3. RELATIONSHIP TO THE UNION:

The club is an affiliated club under Clause C of Section 3 of the Regulations of the Union pertaining to such clubs, and anything in this Constitution or any act of the club or its officers which is inconsistent with the said regulation shall be null and void insofar as it is inconsistent.

4. MEMBERSHIP:

(1) Is open to students and ex-students of Melbourne University who concur with its aims and pay a membership fee of 10¢.

(2) Is open to all other students (Fee: 15¢.) and members of the community (Fee: 20¢.), who concur with its claims.

(3) Honorary permanent membership may be conferred upon individuals, alive or deceased, from time to time as the club sees fit.

5. STRUCTURE AND ORGANISATION:

(1) There shall be a financial committee elected by the Annual General Meeting for a period of one year.

(2) There shall be a secretary elected for a two month period.

(3) The chairman shall be designated by the previous meeting or failing this by the secretary or committee.

(4) For any projects those members supporting them will be considered as an automonous, fully responsible committee.

6. MEETINGS:

(1) General Meetings will be at least bi-monthly. They may be called at the committee's discretion or on petition by ten members, notice and agenda being posted 5 academic days beforehand, except in case of an "EMERGENCY" in which case a meeting may be called at one days notice. (Members being phoned if possible.)

Notwithstanding the above, a meeting of more than 7 members for which minutes are kept may be designated an "EXTRA-ORDINARY" General Meeting by the following General Meeting.

(2) The notice and agenda of the Annual General Meeting shall be posted on the club noticeboard a fortnight in advance. This will include the financial and secretarial reports.

(3) Committee Meetings are to be open and held fortnightly with 3 days notice. If necessary they may be held with 1 days notice.

7. ELECTIONS AND VOTING:

(1) Constitutional change will be by simple majority at a General Meeting a quorum being the smaller of 50% or 15 of the members.

(2) All other issues will be decided by a majority of those voting.

8. FINANCE:

The funds will be kept in a savings account under the club's name and the signatures of the secretary and financial committee. Funds will be drawn on the secretary's and one other signature. Members may only incur debts beyond assets on the basis of personal responsibility. A Petty Cash fund up to $10 may be kept.

AUSTRALIAN-NEW ZEALAND ANARCHIST CONFERENCE (1966)

In may 1966 a number of anarchists from Melbourne (T.R.E.A.S.O.N.), Brisbane (Q.U.A.F.) and New Zealand who were visiting Sydney for various different reasons found themselves all staying at Jack Grancharoff's. (Jack being then - as now - editor of Red and Black.) This opportunity for an anarchist meeting was too good to pass up so the comrades dropped their other business in Sydney and held long discussions on anarchism. In order to get some publicity mileage out of the meetings they constituted themselves as a conference and put out the following press release which, however, is a faithful reflection of the discussions. After the conference the Melbourne and Queensland groups remained in regular contact and tried to implement a common programme. (See the discussion of Student Action For Education below.)

PRESS RELEASE

Between the 23rd and the 27th of May a series of meetings were held in Sydney between anarchists from New South Wales, New Zealand, Queensland and Victoria who declared themselves to be the Australian New Zealand Anarchist Conference (ANZAC). Discussion centred on the formation of anarchist attitudes and programmes relevant to the modern, industrially developed, "warfare" state.

It was decided that anarchists should participate in existing anti-war and anti-government groups to present the anarchist viewpoint, to suggest more effective modes of action and organisation and to heighten awareness of the interconnected nature of various social evils.

In a more constructive vein it was thought that anarchists should undertake both large and small-scale anarchistic co-operative ventures and participate in the formation of libertarian-inclined social action groups.

Finally it was felt that the public was ignorant of anarchism and hence that there should be a greater volume of literature produced and more talks given both criticising various groups and institutions from a libertarian standpoint and propagandising for anarchism as such.

In all things it was thought that the humanist, liberal and empirical habits of thought proper to anarchism should be spread and the instability of the present social structure exposed.

State Correspondents:	J. Grancharoff	(Sydney)
	A. Morgan	(Brisbane)
	A. Giles-Peters	(Melbourne)
	J. Dwyer/R. Benson	(New Zealand)

THE STATE AND POLITICS: SOME DEFINITIONS (1966?)

Society is the totality of relations existing between individuals. A social structure is a more or less persistent set of relations having a function which is compatible with the aims of the group of individuals supporting it. Structures range from fluid ones which depend on direct support to ones that are more rigid and semi or completely autonomous, e.g. the state.

Depending on usage and context the state is either the set of rigid social structures recognised in a particular geographical area or a smaller subset of these. Its function is to manage relations with other like structures and to regulate the activities of other social organisations - most rigid social structures and some fluid ones - in its realm. To do this it may attempt to regulate individual activity.

The state can do this due to its autonomy and possession of the structures of violence and coercion which allow it to function with very little actual support. This power to do so is political power. When individuals or structures other than the state have political power it means that they can ensure the state's functioning in a way compatible with their aims. Other analogous "powers" exist in connection with similar rigid structures but non-state structures lack the monopoly of violence and must rely instead on moral or material coercion.

If politics is hence defined as the activity of fighting for or defending some group's political power, the activity of destroying political power must be anti-political.

From what has been said it should be clear that the individual is better served by and less threatened by fluid structures or by rigid structures without political power. Certainly powers other than political power exist but in the absense of political power they cannot long be used by a minority against a majority as the majority would be able to create alternative structures. Indeed in most cases it would seem that even a minority cannot be coerced without the ultimate guarantee of political power.

A distinction can be made between the individual qua individual and the individual as agent or component of a given social structure. As an agent of the structure an individual must determine policy from the available facts and intended function of the structure or execute such policies determined from its function. In rigid organisations this reduces largely to implementation of standardised "if-then" rules and the individual as such vanishes. When an individual in a rigid organisation starts behaving as an individual the functioning of the organisation is in some sense impaired and in extreme cases it may collapse - e.g. mass revolts in an army. In other cases however such a change may leave the organisation intact but change its total function as with generals' revolts.

GENERAL SCHEMA FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE MANAGERIAL CORPORATIVE STATE FROM THE MODERN STATE TO THE CORPORATIVE STATE. (1966)

Reasons for the development:

(a) Reformist forces expressing themselves through state action.
(b) General economic control (fear of depression and inflation) to maintain the ruling party in power.
(c) Improvement of general political control.
(d) War and expectation of war.

Effects of the development:

(a) Administrative class increases in number.
(b) Opposition to government policies decreases in extent and effectiveness.
(c) Increased nationalist agitation as a prop to the government.
(d) "Closed" states divide world into rich and poor zones.
(e) A new type of class differentiation emerges in political and economic matters.

Roads to Corporativism:

1. From Capitalism.

(a) Controls on the economy and action against inflation and depression.
(b) War, especially against other ideologies.
(c) Rise of oligopoly and collusion between government and extra-governmental agencies.
(d) Enormous increase in "middle-class", "white collar" and upper working-class categories, who are anti-free enterprise capitalist and anti-communist (or socialist), but who support democratic "socialist" measures.
(e) Arbitration and state intervention in the class war.

2. From Communism.

(a) Nationalisation of property.
(b) Single party and elimination of opposition.
(c) Privileged administrative class disposing of nationalised property.
(d) Fear of war against capitalist world.
(e) Development of special civilian and administrative arms - controlled mass movements and secret police - of government.

3. From National Socialism.

(a) Government power over capitalists who are "out of line".
(b) Fear of the irrationality of the rulers; disappearance of the opposition.
(c) Controls over trade unions, churches and other voluntary associations.
(d) Development of special civilian and administrative arms - controlled mass movements and secret police - of government.

(i) Pure dictatorships and military governments develop as in 2 or 3.

4. From Democratic Socialism or Labourism.

(a) Anti-capital laws.
(b) Increased social welfare apparatus.
(c) Some nationalisation.
(d) Union support at first but economic controls later extended to unions - "impartial" government.
(e) No real political opposition - government and opposition espouse almost identical internal policies and by necessity almost identical external ones - because of "national" interests.
(f) Interest in politics declines except on issues that are obviously mismanaged or on issues relevant to a militant minority.

Types of Corporativism

(a) Numbers of large bureaucratic organisations having self-interested leaderships with roughly the same basic interests and tending to interlock.
(b) A single bureaucratic state.
(c) A bureaucratic state with a few other large bureaucratic organisations supporting it.
(d) A bureaucratic, but less effective, state becoming more extensive and gathering other large bureaucratic organisations to it by acquiesence or legislation.

THE STATE (1966?)

1. Aims of the State

(a) long range: aims expressed in its ideology;
(b) shorter range: action to conserve and consolidate its power;
(c) pursuit of the interests of its upper and ruling groups.

2. Methods of State Action

(a) Economic pressures on and military threats to other societies;
(b) Subversion either to bring about conversion to an approved ideology or policy or to remove a threat;
(c) Creation of puppet and client states and use of remote wars to protect state interests, contain other powers, protect military positions and promote or destroy ideologies.
(d) Direct tactical wars to remove small but "close" military threats or centres of other ideologies.
(e) Total war to save its ideology from a major threat.
(f) Internal propaganda to win popular acceptance, smear opposition groups, promote certain group interests and consolidate its position.
(g) Elimination of internal opposition;
    (1) ideological opponents can be killed, arrested, deported, spied on, harassed or made impotent by exposure;
    (2) opponents of short-range policies can be smeared as ideological opponents, dealt with by identification with external interests, by propaganda or by simple appear to authority;
    (3) opposing interest groups can be dealt with as above or bought off.
(h) Altruism: aid to other nations (usually with strings attached); internal aid (either because of obvious necessity, pressure of powerful groups, threat of large-scale revolt or external pressures).

3. Effects of the State

1. Creates and maintains class divisions
2. Causes and prosecutes wars
3. Suppresses individuals and out-groups.
4. Retards social progress.
5. Divides the world politically, economically and militarilly.
6. Creates, defines and punishes criminals.

4. Opposition to the State

1. Demonstrations against war, conscription and military alliances.
2. Agitation for legal reforms.
3. Extra-state activities - Abschol, Freedom from Hunger.
4. Promotion of unpopular movements and ideas.
5. Conscientious non-compliance.
6. Class warfare.

THE IDEOLOGY OF THE MANAGED SOCIETY (1966)

c The changeover from capitalist to managerial or cybernetic society is accompanied by a shift in emphasis from the protestant to the social ethic. (W. Whyte, The Organisation Man). Of course this ethic is an ideology in Marx's sense in which 'Liberty, Equality Fraterntiy' meant 'Infantry, Cavalry, Artillery' since as Whyte noted it was those who paid only lipservice to it who seemed to be moving up. The good life has been identified with integrability into society so woe betide those who are individualist.

In a non-capitalist society the switch occurs through the perversion of revolutionary ideas and ethics so that the state becomes supreme. In the capitalist case society becomes supreme but it is not the society referred to by Kropotkin: society itself has become part of the ideology and the institutionalisation of the social principle has become to some extent a policy - hence the upper-middle class suburban America of which Whyte, Packard, Reisman and Boorstin have written. The basic doctrine is that there is no difference of interests between individual and society (and in the abstraction the latter becomes virtually identical with the state); if there is the individual is maladjusted. The individual is subordinated to the group and the latter judged morally superior.

Naturally to propagate such a doctrine one must wrap it in soft words. The key words are 'security', 'co-operation' and 'adjustment' (with the optional prefix 'mal-'). A generation is rising that must use these words to justify its lack of opportunity to follow its forebears' protestant ethic. A similar doctrine is being propagated in the East where the protestant ethic has never been that strong.

Wrapped in with these words is the "golden tomorrow" - perhaps not as golden as it used to be but stacked with gilt consumer goods. 'A good life for everyone' - proclaim the ideologues of the developed nations while one third of the world starve. In this golden age there will be a surfeit of material goods but so few spiritual ones that even the atheists are worried. Actually under present conditions this averaging is mathematically permissible but meaningless. Whilst the U.S., Europe, Russia, Japan and maybe Australia become over-consumers, squandering the world's resources, the rest of the world except for its ruling classes, who are usually well-fed puppets, will continue to be underprivileged. Past experience shows the folly of thinking that this would be otherwise under right cyberneticism (=managerial society) for many years. Revolutionary left cyberneticism could achieve some equalisation but only by massive immigration, trade and aid plans. Economies could not retain any capitalist character if this were to happen.

The common element of cybernetic doctrines is the concept of information flow but according as this is a one way or a two way flow we have indoctrination and command or interaction and communication. We also have two views of society.

The first view of society and the state is that they are organic and that society is (should be) a mass of interlocking elements or functions in which all (should) contribute and no conflict exists. Hence all information should be used (i.e. all participate) with the aim of achieving homeostasis - or dynamic stability - through feedback and other mechanisms. (In practice of course there will be a large amount of coercion since this model does not accord with the facts). The second view is that the state expresses the real or assumed interests of certain groups and that society takes its form in the dialogue between interest groups (in which the outcome is largely dependent on the power of the political state).

If one now takes the moral stand that the states should not interfere one has the anarchistic position of left cyberneticism which, recognising the existence of conflict, tries to smooth it over by interchange of ideas and by social regulation without legal sanction. This position is not to be judged utopian since it recognises and allows for the inherent conflict between individual and society (i.e. between individual and individuals). It is the basis for the new free society. In the society of right cyberneticism the rulers (who use the ideologies discussed above) would pervert the information system and use the various methods available to them to achieve a homeostasis suitable to them. This would lead, regardless of any utopian soothsaying, straight back to the classical coercive state.

ON CLASSES (1966?)

Some concept of class appears to be fundamental to modern sociology whether explicitly or as "group", "caste", etc., but there are two ways in which 'class' can be used and often a certain confusion results. 'Class' can be used to mean either:

(a) a category into which people are placed with respect to some characteristic - income, religion, etc., or
(b) a large group of people feeling a common destiny or having an in-group feeling.

The former is class in the objective or mathematical sense; the second might be called class in the subjective or psychological sense. Plainly a class in the mathematical sense need not define one in the psychological sense and there may be no (non-circular) definition of a class in the mathematical sense corresponding

to a particular class in the psychological sense.

Needless to say the classes dealt with in sociology are not pure. A class in the objective sense may have a varying degree of subjective class character depending on circumstances. A class in the subjective sense may form which cuts across several obvious class barriers in the objective sense, but may later come to coincide roughly with a class in the objective sense as classes in the mathematical sense may overlap or include others since the division may be purely conventional. (However it is usual at any stage to operate with mutually exclusive and exhaustive classifications in terms of socially relevant characteristics.) Empirically however it is found that certain classes in the first sense are often associated with classes in the second sense. This can sometimes be historically understood from situations in which the two classes were originally identical or where a class in the objective sense suddenly acquired significance from new events or ideas. Four principles of objective division having a high correlation with subjective perception are:-

(a) economic,
(b) racial,
(c) religious,
(d) political.

Economic class is fairly basic to sociological investigation and in most societies the economic stratification is fairly obvious. Economic principles of division may be in terms of difference in general economic function or in terms of a catalogue of different occupations; in terms of income level or source; in terms of income origin by economic sector e.g. primary/secondary/tertiary or production/exchange, etc. Most but not all of these correlate in the societies where they are useful with divisions between income groups.

Racial divisions are not as objective as economic ones in that what is felt as a racial division in a society may have doubtful status. All the same in most societies in which there are two or more races stratification developes. This may be horizontal or vertical; e.g. the Jews in America had virtually their own parallel society whereas the Negroes, although internally stratified, are still considered a lower class in all senses. Sometimes without obvious and drastic stratification a particular racial group may monopolise a certain function in society, e.g. chinese merchants in South-East Asia.

Religious divisions in society are felt in almost the same way as racial ones. In extreme cases there is horizontal or vertical segregation as in the case of the Jews or the Moslems and Hindus. Certain organisations in less extremely divided societies may partake of a definite religious colouration - e.g. the DLP and the catholics or the KKK and the southern methodists - and certain religions may be discriminated against - e.g. the business community and catholics. The ideologies or dogmas expounded by religious groups however are a factor absent from purely racial ones.

Political divisions are obvious in international issues where national feeling tends to override other divisions but there are other political divisions which correlate more closely with the above. These are the divisions corresponding to the possession or non-possession of (internal) political power. It is rarely that a purely political stratification will be felt - i.e. define a class in the pshychological sense - to the exclusion of other types of division but it can happen that the most important division in a society becomes that between administration (or army) and people in which case the government must almost certainly fall.

Most of the other principles of division correlate with that in terms of political power since, as Marx pointed out, economic power constitutes political power in bourgeois society and political power gives economic advantage in feudal (or managerial) society. In many societies also racial divisions correspond to power divisions - but not necessary to economic ones. The same holds for religious divisions since a religion may be part of the establishment or politics the secular arm of religion.

For these reasons simple economic divisions are not necessarily the fundamental ones; indeed much of C20th history is understood in terms of racial, religious and political divisions. The separation of India and Pakistan; the Indonesian revolution; the rebellion in Ghana; the negro question in the USA and the problem of the French-Canadians are not connected with class conflict in any obvious way. (Although it may be claimed that an economically motivated imperial world policy created these problems).

The usual problem today is that of a racial or religious group struggling to hold or extend its economic or political power (usually the latter). Countries where the economic issue is paramount are usually feudal or non-capitalist or capitalist countries with rigid political divisions.

The central issue is that of power i.e. of political class divisions. By the conquest of power economic issues can be resolved by the imposition of a solution from above, e.g. communists try to overthrow capitalist by seizing power through non-constitution means, socialists try to do it by reforms within the system. From political power however new divisions arise - hence a managerial class has been thought to be arising. It almost certainly is the case that a class having power, e.g. a party or an administration, will be economically favoured and may develop or originally have a racial or religious character. In this way racial or religious superiorities may be established or maintained.

THE ANARCHIST PROGRAMME (1966) Some Notes

Social

1. Break up the family as a property interest in the capitalist sense by: free sexual relations, community education and equality of the female.

2. Society to be made up of loosely associated autonomous groups or interest communities: communes, unions, residential villages or blocks of flats, community workshops, pubs, meetings, etc.

3. Abolish law and state-defined crime. Replace by law by social mores and punishment by social disapproval. Theory implies little crime in an anarchist society.

4. Abolish state boundaries along with government. Local autonomy, regional co-operation and free travel and immigration.

5. Administration to be by direct democracy or short-term officials.

6. Education: initially by mother and then by community; ultra-progressive schooling of a general variety; science for everyone; education programmes for adults; community discussions; communication by travel, letters, radio, T.V.; no degrees or standardisation; no compulsory schooling or corporal punishment (as an institution); free expression.

7. Minimisation of special administrative functions.

Economic

1. Abolish class of investors and non-elected executives.

2. Abolish profit system. Production for use.

3. Short-term elected administration for essential tasks. No supervisors or working for profit. Variation of work. On the job control.

4. Organisation of production requires co-operation through industrial unions; liaison however, not control.

5. Fixed wage for all workers in one industry to be paid predominantly as credit at a community store.

6. Exchange of products industry to industry, country to city, making money unnecessary as far as possible. Free services: post, bus, train, etc.

7. Incentives for dirty jobs only.

8. Voluntary communes for food production.

9. Community responsibility for services, relief, education, unemployment - which would be low, support of the sick or mentally disabled.

TWO ROADS FORWARD: RIGHT AND LEFT CYBERNETICISM. AN ANARCHIST PROGRAMME. (1966)

Cyberneticism of the right is a form of the managerial revolution predicted by Burnham. (See James Burnham, The Managerial Revolution). It can operate in various forms although the most efficient and closest to the original model is that of a single state economy presided over by committees of experts and managers. The managerial economy - as Burnham calls it - emerges when the class of individuals having a large share in any particular means of production becomes insignificant in both power and numbers when compared with those having a small share - when the latter are banded together. At this point the means of production are controlled by the higher executives who can - provided they don't make major mistakes - do as they wish. Hence control has passed to people who draw salaries as distinct from wages or profits. Thus the new power group consists of managers of production and executives of finance. As long as the profit system lasts financial executives are needed and these perpetuate the fight between producers of similar goods. The managers, who are interested in efficiency and planning rather than merchandising, have since Veblen been thought to have the idea that co-operation is better than competition. This idea has gained ground and in the U.S. competition between large firms in the same field is often negligible. The most useful analytic device here is the balance of power between buyer and sellar (e.g. J. K. Galbraith's, American Capitalism). Since the endpoint of such a development is a status quo it is to be expected that co-operation between the upper ranks of the various hierarchies will become more common and the feeling between the co-operators will become a class feeling although individual jealousies will continue. This class feeling will give rise to more co-operation in the pursuit of common interests and the members of the high bureaucracy will become in some sense a dominant class.

This movement is already apparent in countries of widely different political structure - although most claim to be democracies - and leads to the conclusion the system existing at present has lost its vitality. Today collaboration between apparently opposed organisations is rarely if ever prosecuted and is coming to be expected; furthermore ideologies today are tending towards countenancing such a system. The future of underdeveloped capitalist countries - including economic colonies - will probably be different since the sizeable organisational structures necessary have not been built up sufficiently to automatically engender a class-producing co-operation. As a result an active campaign by right cyberneticists to seize control of the economy will be necessary. Government departments are here the weapons with which to defeat the numbers of less powerful opponents and to rationalise the economy using committees of experts to plan production and then distribution. The planning of distribution destroys the need for money in the old sense and although it may be kept as a token both wages and prices are controlled by interlocking governmental bodies and the need for money disappears. The economy is then controlled centrally and other social functions would then gradually be taken over by the state. Changes in foreign policy would necessarily result from the economic changes and eventually the committees of government planners and enterprise managers (these would come to overlap) would control the whole economy and nation. Thus in underdeveloped countries the general economic programme of right cyberneticism is bolshevism but with more stress on expertness than previously.

Opposed to this is the programme of left cyberneticism which is a development of anarcho-communism although its efficient working seems to require more control over the individual by the community at large than was originally thought desirable. It is an essentially revolutionary (though not necessarily violently) programme

based on mobility and communication and requiring a party of anarchist propagandists as well as an anarchist influenced and influential mass movement to bring about and provide new social forms.

The aim is to produce food, warmth and housing of an equivalent standard for all and then to leave further ammenities to the community which would form a co-operative interlocking horizontally with other communities. At the same time universal education and re-education would attempt to direct ideas towards an individualist but socially-minded critical approach and education would be given to all to the highest degree possible. Any material surplus over this could be used to settle immigrants or given as foreign aid. A universal militia would be trained for defense and organised on a decentralised basis to avoid being crippled by an atomic strike. Industry would be converted to an automated basis so that quantities of any scarce commodity could be produced quickly and easily to maintain equality.

This rationalised production of necessities by processes automated as far as possible could also be used to produce standard components used to build a variety of things in community workshops. In time the need felt for trivial consumer goods would vanish and whatever remained a felt need would be produced by individuals in the community workshop. The result would be both a decrease in complexity and an increase in design efficiency through the upsurge in creative work. Similarly all other creative pursuits would be encouraged and exchange of informal instruction arranged.

Housing:

The manner in which the problem of housing is solved is of great significance in determining the character and extent of social relationships and the possibility of certain individual relationships. This particularly concerns free love since the stability of the social system is bound up with the ease of having stable relationships of a certain form. It has long been recognised that woman is not the social and economic equal of man in existing society. The property view of marriage still obtains and (married) woman is confined to a greater or lesser extent to the house unless called upon to work for the good of the home. Owning a home in the bourgeois sense means having land and house and implies that the titles be in someone's name. Hence if one partner wishes to leave he or she may find him or herself without any property at all. If the ownership is joint then the problem is more complex since the economic and legal tie will then take time and money to break. Hence in most cases the web of economic and legal ties is sufficient - except in cases of violent conflict - to hold the couple together in passive frustration and resentment. Hence love is submerged in legalism. For this reason it is not surprising that the number of semi-permanent (living together) free-lovers is small. It is only possible when:-

(a) one or both have flats since rent can be on a weekly or monthly basis or

(b) one already has a house and the other does not.

It is inconceivable that two free-lovers should club together to buy or build a house as by its nature this is inimical to free love. The one night stand sort of free love practised hypocritically in the present society (with its consequent devaluing of the partner) is obviously not the sort of foundation desirable for a new society although individuals may continue to practice it.

Hence in a free society the relation of legal ownership and payment for house and land must be abolished. So must the ownership relation to other consumer durables. Then it would be possible for either partner to gather together some clothes and food and may be some personal possessions - certain essential items or inessential items made by that person - and walk out. These are the essential conditions - together with the abolition of any legal reasons for marriage - for free love being generally possible although one would still expect relative monogamy to be the rule.

Children:

Are the other feature of present society militating against free love. It is assumed in our society that although the mother has the right to her children (only the state may override it) she also has a duty to them to sign a contract limiting her attentions to one man and to a certain extent surrendering "ownership" of her

children in return for the necessaries of life. Given a radical extension of social services the material necessity for a husband could be removed and children would not necessarily be a barrier to free relationships although they may constitute a powerful cohesive factor within a relationship. In the event of a break-up the children would be assumed to go with the mother unless there were powerful overriding considerations. It would also be assumed that children would spend most of their time at community centres leaving parents free to pursue other diversions.

Division of Labour:

With the automation of factories and the restriction of factory production to necessaries and simple components only a few workers would be needed, a number more technicians and some administrators. This would make it possible - considering a given factory as being run by the people of one town or an industrial complex by several towns - for people to work in the factory only a few days a week and for jobs to be rotated to some extent. The administration of the factory would be elected and subject to recall by the people of the town and also, since the town would not be self-supporting, by people elsewhere. It would also overlap with the town administration and the national syndicates. By such means a corporate bureaucratic spirit could be avoided - e.g. ancient Athenian administration.

The assembly of components from elsewhere would be done in the community workshop for individual use by volunteers. All administrative work would be voluntary and restricted as far as possible to pure liaison. The land and equipment to work it would be communally owned and the labour division and rotation either drawn up by the village in a small community or by an administrative committee (subject to election and recall) in a larger community. The members of the administration would also have to work. Abuses would be checked by rank and file initiative.

Communications:

All means of communication would be controlled by the community. This means cars, aircraft, trains, radios and television. With cars this means a community car pool of such a number that most requests could be granted without favouritism developing and with overload arrangements for pooling with other communities. With trains this means that the railway - liaison officers, repairmen and drivers - would be drawn from the community and the community would be charged with the upkeep of the lines to it. These functions would also be subject to rotation.

Each community would have sufficient TV sets at its centre to cover the channels available and meet the demand for them. Programmes would be mainly informational or educational with some (high standard hopefully) pure entertainment. Each area would have its own broadcasting centre, both long range and short range so that it could communicate both with its immediate area and with all other communities. All organisations would have access to these on some basis determined by the community. All this would apply also to radio except that they would be personal property.

All travel would be free with train travel preferred over car unless the route by car was much shorter. Some number of undirected car trips per period would be allowed on a community determined basis. Hitchhiking and undirected train trips would be encouraged (each community would have to maintain a hostel). Air trips would only be used in emergency or for long distance trips due to their high cost.

Allocation of labour time:

From the initial hours of work and periods of rotation determined by local communities and national syndicates data on the demand for certain jobs and incentives could be fed into a computer with productivity data supplied by syndicates to produce improved estimates of necessary working time, periods on a particular job and time spent on infrastructural (communications) work. The effectiveness of certain schemes of organisation and/or production could also be tested in this way and the information made available through the communications system.

Aesthetics:

It is essential for a free society that there be a lively interest in the arts of all types.

(a) For pride in the community it must be designed by all in conjunction with experts in art and architecture. The community must decide on its functions and relations, needs and wants, and be designed as a whole accordingly. Within the basic matrix of roads, trees, flowers and community centres each house or building must be planned by its occupants and/or the community for its particular function and also for purely aesthetic considerations. It is to be hoped that building can be rationalised and components mass-produced in easy to use sections. By these means cheapness and variety could be achieved along with low construction costs as the community would build its own houses. Furniture could either be obtained from a community stock or made by the occupants at the community workshop. With this start and a few mass-produced items procured from a community centre pleasantly designed surroundings could be obtained.

(b) All forms of creative self-expression by individuals must be encouraged in order for the individual to develop fully. Hence exhibitions in the community centre, dramatic and musical recitals and the reading of essays and poems should be encouraged. Prose of moderate length is difficult to write and hence not so much would have to be printed. In order to develop individuals in this way classes could be held as part of the wider educational scheme. In cases where tastes run to building or interior-decorating some building materials could be donated to them (and the results probably would be used eventually. Provision must always be made for individuals who want outlandish environment or relationships. Perhaps they would gravitate together preserving a balance between planned community and individual eccentricity).

Education:

In a free society everyone possessing special skills or knowledge must be prepared to teach and all must be prepared to learn. Hence for such individuals one phase of their rotating tasks would be teaching missions to other communities. By such means a high degree of general education would be achieved. The programme would include day classes for children as well as night classes and televised instruction. Periodic lectures in specialised subjects could be arranged and centres set up at which more intensive instruction could be given. Even "fulltime" students would do some work during their study, e.g. the university year could be made 50 weeks in length with 2 or 3 days ordinary work per week with regular teaching tours. The current system of academic progression could be greatly liberalised, course pre-requisites abolished and degrees replaced by certificates to teach. After several years a student would leave, continue on as a student (with the agreement of the university community and the community supporting him or her) or join the staff in teaching, researching and doing outside work. No degrees (other than a teaching certificate) or grades would be given although staff could discuss their course and progress with individual students. Cultural exchange could be promoted by offering foreign students free places under the same conditions. This would increase the spread of ideas amongst the communities as would the above measures.

Until the age of, say, twelve a child would be to some degree expected to be at school, i.e. a social or parental pressure would be justified. After this schooling could become less compulsory although in given cases social pressure could be brought to bear until children were about fifteen. After this only individual approaches would be used. Teachers used in this phase of education would spend most of their time as teachers but would also do other work as part of the policy of rotating occupations. The same teachers could also teach adults but this would mainly be the function of visiting experts. Cultural exchange between communities could be achieved by holding regional conferences and conventions at which papers could be read, ideas discussed, art exhibited and music and drama enacted. Such activities could be broadcast to other regions.

Liaison:

Community problems would be discussed at meetings and those affecting other communities as well further discussed at regional conferences and by national syndicates. These latter would be such things as the anarchist party, its mass

organisations, trades liaison bodies, housing co-operatives, communications workers, consumer associations. These skeleton organisations could then refer the discussion to the people for decision or comment.

Foreign Policy:

The elements of foreign policy are trade, defence and aid. When aid is seen as an end rather than a means and an internationalist attitude created in the people foreign aid could become the function of voluntary national bodies having links with the mass organisations and relevant syndicates.

In a free society defence depends on the people: hence one would one would introduce community militias to absorb the remnants of the old armed forces, train themselves and elect their own officers. These could co-ordinate in a national armed syndicate having access to military advisers (and giving each of its sub-units such access.) Simple advanced equipment could be manufactured and distributed to each community centre - automatic rifles, machine guns, anti-tank and anti-aircraft weapons. Each region would then prepare contingency plans for defence of itself and adjoining regions.

Research and Technical Advisers:

In order that no meritocracy or technocracy is established it is necessary that:

(a) administrators be elected and subject to recall.

(b) experts have an advisory capacity only.

The first requirement here has been dealt with above but the second raises more complex problems. In order for an advisory expert to have full effect and not feel alienated he or she must be in contact with all the people affected by the recommendations in the analysis he or she makes and furthermore in order that these people do not feel manipulated they must see their felt needs reflected in the analysis. In advisory science a standpoint is always implicit; to resolve conflict it needs to be made explicit. Only then can the standpoint and the conclusions it implies be effectively debated. For this reason the agencies investigating should be distinct from the groups, functions and bodies they investigate and they should have free access to the means of communication. Members of pools of experts would sometimes be engaged by social groups to solve problems and would sometimes take up problems on their own initiative. They could be organised in a loose syndicate so that they could live in various different communities and yet be able to co-ordinate their efforts without killing individual initiative.

To some extent such applied experts would also be free researchers since they would not be bound to any particular organisation or community. Since however they, like students, would be supported by the community it would be understood that they would consider a problem when requested to do so or arrange via their syndicate for someone else to do so.

The above is largely concerned with applied social science (although other disciplines may be relevant). For physical research expensive and bulky equipment is required and this would have to be kept in research institutes and be allocated to them by the relevant syndicates. In the event of the research system settling down into conservativism scientists would presumably pressure it through their membership of other bodies of similar stature. Like other researchers physical scientists would be expected to apply themselves to pressing practical problems as well as to pure research and also to teach.

Forms of research not requiring expensive immovable equipment could be carried out by small groups centred about library collections and information centres.

Conflict:

Even in the society envisaged conflict must arise from legitimate clashes of interests between individuals and groups. The problem is to find socially acceptable means of canalising and resolving such conflicts - e.g. community discussion, generally agreed standards of fairness, etc. It is also virtually certain that acts today called

criminal will continue to occur but on a reduced scale. Thus the means of prevention, cure and (to some extent) retaliation must be examined.

Violent Crimes Against Persons:

Unless motives of self-interest are involved these would appear to be due to morbid psychological causes. It is to be hoped that these are non-recurrent or removable. If they are not it may be possible that the effected individual be allowed to lead a normal life on condition that he or she sought help or took preventive action when such a mood was felt to be coming on. In cases of curable or incurable psychosis the decision would have to be left to a doctor's discretion. All possible research would have to be done on the problem of neurosis but with a removal of some of its basic causes its incidence would decline. Most crimes of violence seem to arise from past or present environmental stress and thus appear to be partially curable. In closer knit communities than existing cities their incidence falls considerably because of a number of factors - good and bad. The causes and manifestations of neurosis vary from culture to culture but it is generally found that the less tension or anxiety in a social system the less neurosis there appears to be whether because it is this that causes the neurotic behaviour patterns or is the condition under which the patterns are manifested. In closer-knit, less anxiety-ridden, communities the incidence of violence should fall given the other social changes envisaged. Child-rearing patterns may however still produce the necessary conditions and research is needed on to determine the effects of various patterns.

Comparative sociology and anthropology will probably provide a sufficient empirical basis for generalisations on this subject. Several generations should be sufficient to produce the new personality type suited to the material and spiritual conditions of the new society.

Crimes of Self-Interest:

In a society where the conditions of life are much the same for all people most of the incentive for this sort of crime vanishes. Furthermore in the sort of community envisaged any sort of conspicious consumption would be so glaringly obvious as to be unthinkable.

The "life of crime" would be impossible and whether a large scale robbery was possible would be immaterial since there would be no way of realising on its proceeds. Most material goods - cars, TV's, etc. - would be owned by the community as a whole or made available - housing, furniture, etc. - free to individuals. Also trade would be carried on only by and between communities through their elected officers. Only small quantities of things could be stolen and used and given a reasonable but uniform standard of living the motivation would be low and the threat of immediate recall and public disgrace (for an official) or the disapproval of friends and neighbours (for an individual not abusing official powers) would be sufficient deterrent. Also militating against such selfish individualism would be the feelings of social responsibility and community pride arising from involvement in community affairs. (N.B. It is to be noted here that the community's possessions are owned by the people as a voluntary co-operative with free entry and exit electing their own officers - not as by a state.)

Just as material self-interest would decrease so too would social or political ambition - the one because the envisaged society is egalitarian and the other because the highest posts would be as community administrators or in the syndicates as members of councils of liaison officers. This being so, and because virtually no money would be used in exchanges between communities and syndicates, the incidence of swindling, double-dealing, lying, blackmail and corruption would also decline. Efficiency, humility and contact with the people would ensure a good name; the possibility of excessive re-election would be limited by the customs of the syndicate or community.

The material incentives for administrative work would be the same as for other work and the hours longer. With short periods of office and staggered re-election continuity could be assured without the growth of a corporative spirit. The general tenor of society being one favouring involvement and, to some extent, other-directedness, crimes (and non-crimes) of self-interest would be less frequent and

the levelling of social and economic distinctions in a general situation of material well-being would tend to act in the same way.

Other activities currently considered criminal will not be considered since they are not important here being either:

(a) activities contravening special moral or religious codes which have received state support,

(b) activities only possible in a commercial society,

(c) activities forbidden by "raison d'etat."

Punishment:

The question of punishment has not been touched upon yet and most interest devoted to a consideration of causes. Some action to be taken in cases of crimes against persons has been discussed as have various steps possible in the case of crimes of self-interest.

As well in the cases of such crimes reparations would have to be made - but not excessive ones as this could lead to further violence - or stolen objects returned. Some extra sanctions may also be applied depending on the particular case and the community's judgement of the matter but these could not be such as to make the offender less socially minded.

The emphasis should instead be on sympathy, understanding and kindness - but not unmixed with moral disapproval. Again it must be stressed that private ownership can only be allowed for things made by or given to individuals and for the necessary amount of food, fuel and clothing. Everything else mostly belongs to the community- although it may be used by individuals - and hence if all have equal access crime is unlikely. The emphasis in dealing with crime should be on reform and on the inculcation of the moral attitude proper to such a society: individualism in opinions and works, respect and help for others in actions; that is to say, the reverse of the present society.

STATE, SOCIETY AND INDIVIDUAL (1966)

> 'Governments, religions, fatherlands, morals, in their own interests not only do not recognise individual aspirations, but violate and sacrifice them.'
>
> Virgilia D'Andrea (1890-1932)

There are three basic types of political theory: those in which the ruler is presumed to have the "right" to rule; those in which the rulers, although independent of the people, are presumed to act in their (national) interests; and those in which the rulers are presumed to be in some sense of the people and to reflect their interests. These theories are respectively tyrannical (monarchic), corporativist (fascistic) and democratic. Since the former two have been extensively criticised by democrats I will here consider the relationship of state to individual under democracy.

Aware that on the face of it any state institution is coercive political theorists developed notions such as the "social contract", "free consent of the governed" and "general will" - later vulgarised to "majority will" - to conceal this fact. Obviously though the effect of the latter vulgarisation is the coercion of minorities and that of the first concept is the state's enforced claim to sovereignty over a given area or people. Together they imply that the people are all-powerful and the individual impotent. However as Michels has pointed out representative democracies are in fact oligarchies - if not always plutocratic ones. Imagine the situation of an intelligent independent standing for election in Kooyong. He would canvass the electorate pointing out that he was intelligent, Cooper a fool and Peacock a bastard. How would he answer a voter who said 'Why should I vote for you; my vote won't make

any difference because you need so many and even if you were elected you would be one in many and without a voting bloc'? How would the voter answer if our candidate simply said 'Why vote then?'? Only by the possession of a faction can an individual have power to influence the state, mere membership is insufficient as the oligarchic tendencies operate in factions too - ask any frustrated party member. Since every sphere of life, social and individual, is either now or becoming a province of the state through the latter's alarming proliferation of agencies, departments and regulations it follows that there is virtually no way for the average individual to affect the state and almost unlimited ways for it to affect him.

The freedom of an individual is the amount of control he has over his environment physical or social; his liberties are the limits between which he is constrained. To this extent the savage, the slave and the tyrant are all in chains. In any position in which the individual plays a "role" he is unfree, his position is defined by the rules of that role and to that extent he must deny his personality, values and inclinations. I propose to call any organisation where role-playing positions predominate a 'rigid' organisation. A rigid organisation is necessarily one in which institutional factors predominate and has a formal structure which is both hierarchical and repressive. At the top the leadership is constrained by the modes of functioning and usages sanctified by tradition or expected by their subordinates for, as many a power-hungry radical has discovered, high office in itself is a conservatising influence since one must compromise both to achieve it and to maintain it. On the rungs below the leadership the position quickly becomes purely automatic: orders arrive from above and information from below; a standardised set of rules is applied and the orders or communications dispatched to the next level. Since the individual is here not only reduced to the implementation of directives but must also watch his relations with his superiors and sub-ordinates as well as following traditional and approved forms of behaviour his personality is stunted and denied.

Thus we meet teachers who are always paternalists and pedants and police who are always authoritarian. Indeed rigid organisations attract and select those with incomplete or warped personalities as was pointed out by Comfort in Authority and Delinquency in the Modern State.

In dealing with its subjects a rigid or bureaucratic organisation will be cruelly inefficient since within it control predominates over communication - thus lessening both the incentive for and possibility of informal informative contacts - and between the organisation and its subjects there is only formal communication. Because the more human needs are not considered by the organisation (because they are individual and hence not "relevant"), and since there is a lack of essential informal contact between the organisation and its subjects and within the organisation itself, the organisation will function on inadequate information and without a "feeling" for the problem thus leading to a complete disregard of its individual aspects as well as to a delayed and inadequate solution. Finally the administrative, or bureaucratic, approach of the rigid organisation relies on and encourages that frame of mind that considers fellow human beings as ciphers and as objects of manipulation.

It is obvious that the state and its supporting structures are rigid organisations and that throughout them the bureaucratic approach with its denial of individual needs prevails. However a position of power is an ever present temptation to act not only in an authoritative - bureaucratic manner but also in an authoritarian - moralist manner. Guardians of public morals, promoters of the national interest, the self-styled defenders of orthodoxy and tradition; all swarm about the existing power groups or develop their own to promote and impose their particular interests and opinions. The humanist and the christian both appeal to abstract right in order to impose their personal or institutional preferences. Representatives of arms manufacturers call for extra defence spending in the "national" interest. Investors in foreign markets argue that stability, democracy and self-determination require foreign capital, foreign bases and "stable" government.

In a representative democracy every narrow, sectarian and petty interest must be dressed up as a moral or national imperative. Parties which during election time deliberately appeal to specific interests, and even claim to represent particular class interests, on coming to power claim that they represent the nation - even though their majority may depend entirely on electoral boundaries and not even

represent the largest vote. It is seriously argued - and to a large extent practised - that democratic assemblies can legislate on matters of morals; this shift from 'I would' to 'you should' to 'he must' is characteristic of representative democracy where every question tends to be debated at the highest level and the result of the deliberations of the members of the loosely interlocking oligarchies determines the matter for all people for all time. Leadership works its will through legislation rather by example. Similarly from the "justice" of a war is derived the "morality" of conscription for it. In previous states it was at least assumed that the leaders had a prior right to do what they wanted; today we have specious arguments to prove that the leaders are doing what we want (or need).

Since the bureaucratic approach ignores individuality and the moralist attacks it in the service of his own group interests it follows that the state, which selects these types for its oligarchs, must be the absolute enemy of human freedom and individuality, indeed of social life and humanity.

The reference to social life is important for, to paraphase Buber, the state principle and the social principle are inversely related. Social life is wholly (or should be wholly) relations between free individuals, i.e. informal contact and voluntary association. However society is a somewhat general concept since it includes relationships between groups and networks of individuals which are both purposive and necessary, e.g. industry. Here though we must distinguish between the imposition of a formal pattern of behaviour through a natural necessity as in the case of our relations with nature through technology and the imposition of a formal pattern of behaviour by social, religious or political means. There are rigid social organisations in the latter sense which are distinct from state organisations as ordinarily conceived but if one slightly extends the concept of state or political organisations from that of purely government ones to cover all rigid organisations in a society Buber's principle is true subject only to the rider above on the natural limits of social freedom.

Reverting to the ordinary sense of state it is worthwhile pointing out that the existence of relatively complex stateless societies shows that 'society' need not imply 'state'. However the status of the individual in such societies will still depend on whether they are dominated by authoritarian relations, strong clan systems, tradition, superstition or religion, i.e. on whether they have a political structure in the wider sense.

An alternative to rigid organisations exists that I will call 'fluid' organisations. In contradistinction to rigid organisations which are self-perpetuating and self-interested this form is completely task-centred. It utilises functional leadership instead of having privileged permanent leadership in order to prevent the growth of oligarchic elites. It emphasises voluntary as opposed to compulsory participation to lessen the possibilities of power and corruption. It emphasises the importance of making decisions at their own level by those immediately concerned. It amounts to the de-institutionalisation, decentralisation and democratisation of all social structures and their control by interlocking networks of natural interest groups instead of the centralisation of power by self-interested elites in powerful and mutually opposed structures. It stresses the possibility of communication's being more effective than political control in an egalitarian society where all have approximately the same interests.

The case for the desirability of stateless fluid organisations is both social and technical. On the one hand the increased opportunities for participation are a factor in developing individual potentialities and the common group interest and necessity of co-operation tend to promote sociability. On the other hand by being task-centred and free of traditional forms, by having a leadership changing according to need and an enthusiastic co-operative membership the fluid organisation has a greater information capacity (i.e. greater power to discriminate between cases) and a faster feedback or reaction time than the traditional rigid organisation and is hence necessarily more efficient.

STUDENT ACTION FOR EDUCATION (1966)

1966 saw the start of the movement towards militant professionalism amongst teachers and campaigns for improvements in secondary education by N.U.A.U.S.'s university constituents. The anarchists joined into the latter student campaign and also contacted more radical teachers to see if there was a possibility of joint action. It was decided to set up a specifically anarchist education group aiming at starting a secondary school student movement (something that didn't happen until the late 60's). To do this the anarchists at Melbourne and Brisbane universities tried to affiliate clubs called 'Student Action for Education'. The aims section of the common constitution is printed below together with a leaflet written for the campaign by a student at MacRobertson Girls High School.

STUDENT ACTION FOR EDUCATION: AIMS

The aim of the club shall be to start a student movement within schools and universities in co-operation with sympathetic members of the teaching profession and other interested groups or individuals to:

1) Present plans for reform

2) Agitate and fight for these reforms

3) Develop a student structure that will tend to take increasing responsibility for aspects of both the discipline and the education of its members.

The Melbourne University/Queensland University club shall act as the financial arm of the above movement as well as acting as part of the movement on the above basis.

This sheet is written in the conviction that by united action alone can students and teachers effect essential reforms in education. We live obstensibly in a democracy, but there is no democracy in education. The student has no say in making the rules (if sixth formers are old enough to enforce the rules, then they are old enough to help make them). The student has no part in shaping his curricula (neither do his teachers); his choice of course is largely determined by others. At the moment students and teachers are forbidden to a great extent from communicating on the subject of education. What else would it be possible to discuss?

Hitler, Mussolini, Mr. Rylah and the University of Tasmania all maintained that those in power, themselves, acted in the best interests of their subjects or subordinates. Germans, Italians, Victorians and Tasmanians disagreed. It serves the ends of authority to render resistance on the part of students hopeless and ineffectual. What is of importance to the administrators is the production of qualified economic units; human sausage-skills are crammed indiscriminately with a miscellaneous jumble of information to be regurgitated when the dreaded prod of examinations is applied. The finished products then plop neatly off the conveyer belt into one of several predetermined social receptacles. No provision is made for academic failures or for those (a small minority) who deem the whole process iniquitous and meaningless. The intelligent and questioning are stunted by unimaginative system-bound teachers, the sensitive often maimed mentally for life. Any benefits are gained despite the system rather than because of it.

There is marked emphasis on outward semblance, on ritual blindly observed. The captive audience at assemblies responds collectively to administered stimuli: feats performed for the school are praised and dutifully applauded, orders given are executed, warnings dispensed and heeded. Extra curricular activities assume special precedence; a scintillating array of these greets the new student, who is encouraged to take part and have his surplus energies channeled harmlessly. Yet another means is found to bolster the school's reputation. Sports matches, socials, house activities and inter-school competitions all savour of regimentation. To bring honour to the school and perpetuate the illusion of enjoyment within strictly defined limits are the aims students are exhorted to strive for. The distraction afforded by a school function helps fill time that might otherwise be wasted in idle

thought, or worse still, dangerous criticism.

If ideas contrary to those of the regime are expressed, they are suppressed on the grounds that they will corrupt innocent school children. Controversial issues are avoided like the plague, problems are never frankly examined. The traditional picture of the mass of pupils seems to be one of a flock of milk-white lambs requiring careful supervision and protection, hormetically sealed off from all evil. To contradict this there is the readiness of authority to presume offenders guilty and the rest potentially so - to protect them from themselves and their baser instincts. Both these misconceptions can be used to threaten the passive majority and to eliminate the disobedient. All keep silent because they exist in a state of fear.

The only way this can be remedied is by united and purposeful action. The teachers have already started agitating, but there is much the student can do. A powerful student body could request reforms in conjunction with teachers. It could demonstrate, hold discussions on appropriate topics taboo in schools. It would hence assume, along with progressive teachers, much of the responsibility for educating itself for "life" not for exams.

EDUCATION FOR FREEDOM (1966)

In this article I am going to take the view that the aim of school is teach methods and attitudes rather than facts: to create ethical beings, not to teach obedience, Both these aims are realised in the task-centred method of teaching.

There are three basic types of teaching relation possible in a classroom. Schematically they may be characterised as Authoritarian, Paternalist-Authoritarian and Paternalist-Democratic or Authoritative. If we represent these by diagrams of arrows representing communicative interaction then in the first all arrows point out from the teacher, in the second all arrows point either from or to the teacher and in the third arrows point in both directions between any two individuals. In the authoritarian mode the lack of feedback or reciprocity means that the pupils are being taught as a de-personalised mass - this form of teaching is typified by rote learning, masses of problems from a book, insistence on silence and ritual, harsh punishment and poor results.

In the paternalist-authoritarian model the teacher communicates with pupils on an individual basis. The teacher tries to help individuals, is less insistent on ritual (except for silence) and really attempts an interesting individualised approach to the lessons. However pupil to pupil communication is disallowed - a typical comment being 'If you want to know ask me!' - and there is also a nervousness in the teacher about losing authority. (In the pure authoritarian case this nervousness becomes pathological).

Under the paternalist-democratic system the teacher does not have power, does not want it and does not need it. His only authority is intellectual and, as such, it can be replaced on occasions by the authority of a pupil. Discipline is not a major issue since the teacher knows that the class itself will keep its noise level to one of efficient working. The teacher is just a member of the group, albeit at first a superior one. The aim of this method is to erase this initial distinction; to raise the pupil's intellectual level and self-discipline (and group-discipline) to the teacher's.

This latter model of teaching is revolutionary - it is little preached and less practised. For obvious reasons it is desirable and for equally obvious reasons not desired. By removing arbitrary power and externally enforced discipline it breeds adults who are self-reliant and self-disciplined, both more group-oriented and more individual. It is the despair of those who wish to exert power and authority, i.e. those who do so now. It may indeed be argued that the new adults would be anti-authority. For this reason, and also as it might be thought impossible, it needs justification.

Although the general idea outlined above was advocated by free-thinkers and anti-authoritarians last century their thinking tended to be hampered by an almost

completely authoritarian (and monistic) environment and upbringing and lacked theoretical and empirical justification. This century a number of practising educators and youth-workers have evolved similar ideas in their own work; the ideas can also be derived from mathematical models and psychology. Homer Lane, David Wills and A.S. Neil are the best known practitioners and exponents of these ideas in youth work and education although writers such as Paul Goodman, Herbert Read and Alex Comfort should also be mentioned.

If we consider learning as being a continuous process of overcoming problems of understanding then obviously that system which maximises communication and pooling of knowledge will be most efficient. Thus even if teaching is of traditional subjects in the traditional individual way the paternalistic-democratic system should still be most efficient of the three. (Of course if a joint task approach is adopted this can only be done through this system.) Approaching the matter somewhat differently we can distinguish between rote or simple stimulus, single stimulus and response and multiple stimulus and response systems. Unless the student's - or teacher's - processing facility becomes overloaded the latter obviously is a superior method of dealing with problems.

The next point returns us to the title of this article: this is that if education is education for a democracy - i.e. for a free social life - then the attitudes and skills of social relationships required for a free society must be acquired at school. Plainly it is only the paternalist - democratic mode of organisation that mirrors the relationships of a free society and it is only in this mode that the ethics of social responsibility can be learned through experience rather than taught by rote. Both the other forms are geared towards producing adults who will look to institutional leadership or authority figures rather than taking initiative and co-operating with their fellows. Finally only the paternalist-democratic mode of teaching abolishes the sharp break between school and life.

There are also some other points that can be made about the education appropriate to a free society. If task-centred teaching is to be used so that pupils learn as a group then there should be no streaming by ability but only by abilities. There should not however be separate schools for different sorts of interest patterns but rather where possible groups should be mixed together for tasks or subjects of common interest. Each person must be encouraged to develop his or her own particular excellence.

At present the tendency of the education system is to educate people too highly if the aim of education is taken to be economic. Everyone is being given extensive training for a race that a fixed proportion must lose. Not surprisingly then there is discontent; the masses are slightly overeducated for the jobs they are forced to do and the relative shortage of highly paid or high prestige jobs - and of course this is a necessary shortage - intensifies the race. Hence the whole aim of education must change from an economic one to a spiritual one. As the polarisation between the upper class of scientists and the lower class of button pushers increases there will be less and less need for better education (for economic survival). If however the aims of education are social and spiritual - intended to make a freer society and to produce individuals who can realise their potentialities - then the opposite conclusion follows.

Appendix: a note on lectures.

The paternalist-democratic mode of school instruction will also ease the transition from school to university since the student will be able to make full use of tutorials and learn by him or herself from books. It might be wondered however how such a student would react to lectures, which seem on first sight to be classical examples of the authoritarian mode. The difference is that whereas a lecture is impersonal the lecturer does not necessarily have the same power relations to the student as the authoritarian teacher. (Thus, for instance, attendance may not be compulsory, other teaching methods are used as well, students can learn for themselves.) The main difference in fact between a lecture and a book is that in the latter case the student can vary the times and the rate at which he absorbs the information. Despite this relative inferiority of the lecture the difficulty of finding appropriate books or of reading those available may well justify the

giving of lectures - at both school and university - as condensed books or papers. However to make sure that a lecture does function like a book it should be given to a mass audience removed from the normal teaching process and its content discussed afterwards by smaller groups.

THE MODERN STATE

The modern state's ideal is the corporative state, that type of state that appeared in extreme form under Mussolini and Hitler and in a less extreme form under Franco. (I use the word 'corporative' to refer to this pattern of politico-economic organisation as the usual term 'fascist' has by now lost all precise meaning.)

This sort of state has arisen as a response to modern conditions; in particular the increasing complexity of the economy, the revolutionary attempts and formerly acute political aspirations of the lower classes, the increasing incidence and cost of war and the desire of ruling elites in all spheres to increase their control over the masses.

The primary symptom of this is the progressive erosion of parliamentary power and the transfer of decision-making to the cabinet and head of state who are linked mainly with the heads of the civil service. Once parliament does not make decisions and only Holt does he does so on the basis of the information and interpretations given to him by the departmental chiefs together with their suggested courses of action. Unless the head of state is strong the country comes to be run by the heads of departments. To a large extent parliamentary debates become an irrelevance together with most other parliamentary activity. In consequence ex-progressive clubs like the ALP club come to deny the validity of any political activity beyond that of finding reasonable motives for doing what the government has already done by virtue of its stupidity, cruelty or ineptitude. The result is political apathy.

This sort of government appeals to the salaried and professional classes who are foreign to conceptions outside the narrow ambit of short-range planning and avoidance of responsibility, who distrust independent initiative or radical change and who are totally dominated by petty-bourgeois thinking and values. In the west these are also the groups most susceptible to nationalistic appeals since they lack the imagination to understand the cosmopolitan parisites above who still profit no matter what anti-capital laws are enacted and would only be destroyed by complete socialisation - of which the salaried groups can hardly conceive. The working class at least maintains a certain cynicism about governments and their allies.

Apart from the obviously sterile features of such a state it also has some positively evil ones. First it is a class state and hence divides society against itself quite apart from the additional complications introduced by racial and religious divisions. Secondly it is an "economic" state; one in which work is emphasised at the expense of the play side of man's nature, i.e. the "real" triumphs over the erotic. The result of this economic and class nature is tension, envy, frustration and (some) real need all of which tend to produce mental illness and amoral behaviour - the institutional reaction to which further divides the society and degrades the individual. It is also interesting that such a state retards the intellectual progress on which material progress depends by its administrative discouragement of independent thought and initiative. (Cf. the myth current in the U.S. that scientific progress depends on teams rather individuals and that in any case there are no important theoretical advances needed.)

Modern states have divided the world into mutually antagonistic rich and poor areas, 'Free' and 'red' areas, white and coloured areas, etc and the homeostatic self-interested and a moral nature of the administrative machines tends to perpetuate and intensify these divisions. The tensions caused by this have transformed the world into a shifting network of armed camps with continual outbreaks of violence where they overlap. These objective conditions together with the lunatic subjectivity of nationalist feeling continually push the world to the brink of total war.

Obviously universal brotherhood or understanding is impossible under these conditions and within the state individual moral responsibilities have been transformed into legal ones and the domain of individual responsibilities is steadily shrinking

to zero. Soon the only socially and morally responsible man will be the man against the state.

MODERN APPROACHES TO ANARCHISM (1966-7?)

Anarchism is the theory and practice of stateless organisation. That is to say it is socialism in its pure form and until about 1920 its history was that of the left-wing of the socialist movement for although the left and right trends had parted with invective and mutual expulsions there was not as yet open warfare between them. However with the revolutions and civil wars in Russia, Germany and Spain the gulf between those who would seek a solution for, and those who would seek it with, the people opened irrevocably with more militants escaping the Falange than the Cheka.

The few anarchists who escaped the ruins of Catalonia, Munich and the Ukraine settled in scattered emigre colonies out of touch with the people around them. The blanket of "socialist" propaganda kept the name and significance of anarchism hidden since, like Mussolini, Lenin knew who his main enemies were. Soon anarchism was an historical oddity forgotten by all save a few ageing militants and academics - the latter nearly universally misunderstanding it.

The renaissance came as people in different countries came to realise the truth of anarchist ideas of up to 150 years standing. The former militants - now frustrated idealists - had gathered into groups which mainly discussed sterile questions such as the form of post-revolutionary society; others however went in for more fertile studies: the general theory of organisation, the meaning of social and ethical theories, the application of the anarchist attitude in criticism of existing society and its ideologies.

At this juncture there grew out of the a-politicism of the masses, who had become disillusioned with all governments and ideologies, a new "anti-politicism" which expressed itself in mass anti-war and anti-nuclear arms movements, civil rights and anti-censorship movements. Although quite often started or influenced by the more cynical groups on the left the mass base of such movements was usually young and anti-political. In countries with propagandist anarchist groups this unconscious anarchism became conscious; in Britain, Holland and Sweden the old groups grew again, in the USA a renaissance seems likely. In New Zealand completely new groups sprang up. New publications appeared: a new monthly in England and a new IWW monthly in Chicago, a periodical in Sydney, a pamphlet series and crop of peace movement journals of radical left inclination in Britain. Some older journals underwent a modernisation and changed their line to a more socially relevant one. These started to offer, instead of old theoretical discussions, current comment and analyses; to preach the ideas of mutual aid (solidarity if you are worker), direct action (self-help to the middle-class) and fluid organisation (anarchy to everyone). The libertarian idea of the emancipation of the people by their own efforts was restated against the background of labour governments incapable of doing more than making capitalism efficient and of communist governments being incapable of doing less than creating a new privileged "technocratic class". The uncompromising anarchist stand against war and racism was restated.

As yet no anarchist movement has grown back to the point of having social influence but in England the movement is large enough for the anarchists to form a definite faction within YCND and play an important part in demonstrations and they may soon start to influence the rank and file in trade unions. If anarchist movements are to become socially significant they will have to undertake social projects: set up housing co-operatives, libertarian schools and "factories for peace". They must become the major rank and file influence in the unions as advocates of worker control on the shop floor, joint consultation under existing society and complete worker/consumer control in any re-organisation of society.

They must fight for factory committees against craft unionism and the trade union bureaucracy and develop new forms of "creative" sabotage to supplement and/or replace the traditional strike, "go-slow" and "wooden shoe." Similarly they must be prepared to espouse direct action in their antimilitarism campaigns; to use sedition and sabotage to subvert the "warfare" state. They must be prepared to live their anarchism.

On this basis a modern anarchist movement would consist of a group of creative and critical theoreticians publishing both newspapers and theoretical journals associated with, on the one hand, a wider circle of activists and propagandists working in trade union, anti-war, civil rights and mutual aid organisations and, on the other, with groups of people involved in communes and co-operative enterprises with all living as far as possible in an anarchist way: ignoring the state, practising mutual aid and have free (non-coercive) associations and socio-economic relations.

The relationship of this sort of anarchism to the revolutionary movements of Spain and - to a lesser extent - of France and Italy have yet to be worked out. The future of the Spanish movement with its large disorganised underground and exiles in France, Italy and England is not clear; certainly new theories and modes of organisation will be necessary. There may indeed be a future for revolutionary anarchism, Hungary showed that socialists when throwing off a "socialist" dictatorship spontaneously organise in libertarian socialist, i.e. anarchist, modes. Certainly no revolution or revolt in an Eastern bloc country would want bourgeois democracy although under the influence of socialists and communists a revolution in a country like Spain would return to the republican form of government.

Whatever may happen it is obvious that the chances for socialism have not yet all vanished and future theoretical developments will depend largely on the public reaction to the world political situation.

THE RELEVANCE OF ANARCHISM (1967?)

The word "anarchism" has various associations: bearded terrorists or cataclysmic revolution for the ordinary public; quaint village communities for the social anthropologist; and irrationalist revolutionary visions for the political scientists. Today it is more reasonably associated with campaigns for nuclear disarmament, pacifism and advocacy of free love and the freedom to read.

This diversity of images reflects the diversity of manifestations of the anarchist ideal through the last 200 years. Libertarian socialism or anarchism appeared first in William Godwin's writings on education and on the political order which incorporated many anarchistic criticisms of society coupled with an environmentalist theory of character and the vision of freedom. Godwin's major work Political Justice inspired Malthus's Essay on the Principle of Population as a rebuttal of the view that the whole of mankind could be free and happy. The idea re-appeared in the writings of the French peasant socialist Proudhon who advocated credit banks for labour and produce exchange combined with a loose political federalism. Such ideas remainded the basis of constructive anarchist theory until the time of the syndicalists and anarcho-communists although the collectivists opposed the Proudhonian mutualists on the question of private property.

The next group of anarchists were the revolutionary collectivists grouped around Bakunin. Their criticisms of philosophy, religion and capitalist society were typical of the materialist socialism then forming the revolutionary current in the First International and hence Bakunin's writings in many ways remind one of Marx's except that whilst a brilliant thinker he was also an activist and rarely finished writing a pamphlet let alone a book. Marx and Bakunin were the leaders respectively of the authoritarian and the libertarian wings of the International and their clash destroyed the organisation. Most of Europe's revolutionary socialists - except the German - supported the anarchists and so even after Bakunin's death his vision of a cataclysmic revolution lived on. As a result anarchism is sometimes damned by those who have only read (quotes from) Bakunin - or the semi-syndicalist writer Sorel who saw revolution as a desirable moral regenerative.

Towards the end of the C19th anarcho-syndicalism was developed. This was the French idea of a confederation of loosely organised militant unions fighting the capitalists and their state and awaiting the revolutionary general strike when the existing syndicates and bourses du travail would form the basis of the new society.

About the same time anarchist-communists laid the theoretical foundations for anarchist social organisation on the basis of Kropotkin's theory of mutual aid in opposition to the capitalists adaptation of Darwin's theory of natural selection, i.e. survival of the fittest. All previous socialists had, of course, recognised the importance of

mutual aid in society - even the individualist school of Max Stirner who envisaged a union of egoists - but Kropotkin connected this up with his biological and historical studies. The anarchist-communists were as influenced by agrarian as industrial problems and there were peasant anarchist revolutions in Mexico, Spain, and the Ukraine. In Mexico the anarchists almost saved the revolution but were defeated by opportunistic ex-peasant generals corrupted during the war. In the Ukraine the Makhnovist guerilla army defeated the Germans, helped defeat the White Russians and were finally defeated themselves by the Red Army under Trotsky during the period of the elimination of political opposition. The last major revolutionary endeavour was in Catalonia where peasant and industrial anarchists held almost complete economic power until destroyed in the political infighting promoted by the communists in their attempt to destroy the left and throttle the revolution.

By this time the vulgar marxian thesis of increasing misery for the working class was becoming increasingly irrelevant to western society and in order to become a social force again anarchists had to rethink their position - especially since their numbers were scattered and greatly diminished by persecution in the USSR, USA, Germany, Mexico and Spain and they were overshadowed by the rise of social-democratic reformism in the developed world and nationalist socialism in the under-developed countries. The results of such a rethinking are both interesting and depressing since along with a redefinition of revolution in evolutionist terms there has been a rise of pessimism which denies utopia to the point of denying the use of struggle. More constructively there has been a rise in interest in questions of education, work satisfaction, the problems facing youth, and questions of non-violence and nuclear disarmament.

The anarchist is not immoral or amoral as some have suggested since a revolutionary position must be fundamentally a moral one. His position is not that man is naturally good but that moral qualities are not in any sense natural, that the individual mind is plastic and that the child will to a greater or lesser extent reflect its society on coming to adulthood. Hence fundamental changes in society will vastly change what conservatives call human nature. Given this theory of the relationship of individual character to society the anarchists holds that many undesirable features of social life are strict consequences of the structure of society and that artificial structures such as institutional religion, the state, etc. are both unnecessary and pernicious in that they obstruct the "dangerous march of humanity" and suppress individual creativity and self-realisation. Further they produce authoritarian social relations and destroy the feelings of equality and individual social responsibility - the preconditions for healthy social relationships.

These empirical criticisms of the state are moral ones on the anarchist basis that personal relations, individual creativity, equality, belongingness and mutual aid are paramount values and that society should be reconstructed accordingly. These moral feelings are purely individual and are not to be considered a priori standards - although occasionally confusion arises on this point - and the anarchist movement at any time consists of those who feel this way - and admit it. This is why much anarchist rational criticism sounds religious and why radical opinions are held with such fervour.

Hence basically anarchism is a moral position with social application nourished, if not by the objective possibility of the golden tomorrow, at least by the presence of that gold in the individual.

ANARCHO-REFORMISM; THE C20TH AND AFTER (1967)

If the C19th anarchists and their descendents in the earlier C20th were revolutionaries then their successors and counterparts in the later C20th must be called reformists. By this I do not mean that anyone has started a parliamentary Anarchist Party, but simply mean to refer to their preoccupation with small scale enterprises and reforms not only as examples to back up their theories but as ends without either the appeal to a Utopia or the felt need for revolution.

This reformism is understandable in that the main centres of anarchist thought are in developed and reasonably liberal countries where for most people the need for revolution is not great, i.e. there is no revolutionary class. Furthermore anti-utopianism and scepticism are attitudes common amongst the "free" C20th intelligentsia

and whilst constituting a reaction against dogmatism have been carried so far that any plan or suggestion is suspect.

Reformism is also satisfying in that many anarchists have read the pessimistic Italian sociologists and wish to be spared the necessity of having a revolutionary elite to guide the revolution whether from above or within for the reformist need only represent a viewpoint within an institution and is hence spared the stigma of authoritarianism.

As a result in those countries in which revolution is necessary the anarchists have left the struggle to others with less understanding of power and fewer scruples in its pursuit. Reformism of course is only defensible where it is practicable - and revolution not practicable.

In countries where reformist aims are realisable there are many fruitful fields of activity for anarchists. Firstly a constant stream of criticism can be levelled at the Government and other enemies and the libertarian alternative stated. This is the background against which anarchists must present their positive reforms. In most countries organisations exist, or can be set up, espousing sexual freedom, educational reform, industrial re-organisation, direct foreign aid, self-help in housing and recreation and disarmament; anarchists can work in all of these. Furthermore legal reform is being pressed by certain organisations and anarchists can join in here too. Various weapons present themselves: verbal or written propaganda, civil disobedience, demonstrations and other forms of direct action. At all costs anarchists must resist the tendency of these organisations to go through the proper channels.

From what has been said it follows that revolutionary methods can be used to achieve reformist aims. The reverse is also true. Reforms eventually topple or replace the system they were propounded for. Hence some idea of a longer range aim must be kept in mind when advocating reforms for otherwise they can become pernicious. (e.g. England is neither a socialist or a capitalist paradise). The anarchist aims to improve the society and destroy the state. Hence the reforms he espouses must as far as possible remove spheres of social life from the state's control and he must try to show the state's incapacity for beneficial changes. The aim then is the removal of government prerogatives and the destruction of public worship of governments - if not confidence in them.

In its classical forms anarchism failed although this was not always due to anarchist ideas being poor or inappropriate. This does not mean that anarchist aims will always be unfulfilled or that anarchist society is impossible. It simply means that if anarchism is again to become a living movement, if it is again to inflame and move large numbers, if it is to influence other movements and gain new adherents, then anarchists must seek new ways, make new suggestions and put themselves in the van of all aspects of the progressive movement.

AGAINST STUDENT TURNS (1967)

How did you enjoy the Science B-B-Q last Saturday; or that piss-up out at Kew? Maybe that depends on how many other turns you've been to in the past few weeks. Did you get pissed? Or even ultimate of ultimate glory-chunder?

And what about Ed's new white Triumph (hotted up: "Shit it can go") that you talked about; did that extend your imagination, excite you as a person? Ah well back to the grind for another week. Then if we drink enough and talk enough of cars and birds we can try to forget it all at the gas turn this Saturday. Oh, as to the blokes - did you finally succeed in screwing the bird? La Dolce Vita. We hear that the final product of this anti-person society which has produced us is about to come on to the market - the automatic bed, with adjustable stroke (supplied with inflatable plastic women, of course).

Some - peculiar misfits - still believe it is possible to meet a woman and not a bird, to make love and not to have a screw. They are visionaries, today's anti-social heroes, who in their rebellion assert man as a social being and not as a machine cog. That they transform their vision to practice may not be irrelevant.

CONSCRIPTION (1967)

Once more the government elected by the Australian voters of age twenty-one, has seen fit to violate the rights of Australian youth to life, and the pursuit of happiness: another group of young men has been conscripted! There is only one way to fight such an unscrupulous and immoral foe - DEFIANCE!

Demonstrations are all very well, but the kind of defiance that I have in mind is the kind one sees in the members of Queensland's Society for Democratic Action: Arrested last year in anti-conscription marches organised by N.U.A.U.S., many of them are still serving jail sentences imposed on them because they have refused to pay their fines.

Going to jail is not amusing. There is a strong chance of injury and maltreatment. Last time, one of my personal friends was put in solitary confinement and on half rations because he refused to salute the flag when he came in! By no means did he do it out a sense of bravado, nor did he do it to see what they would do to him (Queensland students know the touch of the arm of the law); he refused to salute the symbol of state power.

For it is the State which conscripts, it is the State which wars and only that State and its minions which will profit from the wanton traffic in human happiness.

This mad carnage will not stop by itself; that state-machine careers across humanity. There is only one way to stop it: we must throw ourselves in its path! We may well count the cost in terms of the disapproval of friends, of having a security file, of having a criminal record, of missing government employment; but would you prefer to count the cost of silence? Its currency is derangment, maiming, crippling, deforming; its dividend is death.

ON THE FAMOUS DEBATE: SOCIALISM IN AUSTRALIA (1967)

Although an overwhelming majority of students at the last Union debate ("That there is no need in Australia for a Socialist Party") voted in favour of Socialism, the result is less edifying for socialists than may seem at first glance.

Both sides agreed ossentially on the topic. The only differences were matters of emphasis. The socialist side wanted a little more equality and slightly more competition in industry. Complete nationalisation was certainly not essential - but even if it were, there would be few real differences in society, except the obvious economic ones.

The main aim was to give the people a larger share of the capitalist cake.

And who would deny them this? Certainly not the Liberals!

Socialism was only an extension of the welfare state and involved no radical change in society at all.

The Liberals agreed that there should be a more equitable distribution of the produce of society.

Whence it followed (though none of the speakers pointed this out) that there was already a basically socialist party in power in Australia - The Liberal Party! The proclaimed politics of the Liberal Party are socialist!

People mentioned "quality of life" few times - and when they did, quality of life was exemplified by better economic conditions. Nobody was worried about individuality, happiness and freedom in a society where "the fetishism of commodities" is all but the official doctrine.

Not one speaker pointed to the entirely different framework in which a socialist society exists. Socialism begins with individual freedom and dignity, and recognises that a truly free person can only exist in a truly human society.

Socialism implies a positive and radical transformation of capitalist society in all its aspects. Nationalisation of industry can only provide the economic basis for the new society. It can only be a condition for the free development of the individual.

According to these conventional socialists, the only real criticism to be levelled at the Liberal Party is that they are failed liberals!

MARX, SOREL AND THE NORDIC WORLDVIEW (1967)

It is an irony of history that some (misguided) commentators have seen in Marxism the logical conclusion of the ancient Germanic mode of thought while completely overlooking the secular socialist movement. Nothing could be more opposed to the norse mind than the voluntarist destiny of the State - the only norse part of it was its fall in 1943, and even this was not very nordic since there was a lack of noble men foreseeing it. The "Reich to last a thousand years" is much more obviously a christian concept.

It is certainly no accident that secular socialism developed under the influence of German philosophy of history which, warped almost unrecognisably to the extremes of Hegel, was slowly brought back to the correct view by Marx, who, although sufficiently warped by his rationalism and Jewish bourgeoise background to see it as being 'progress' was able to give a largely correct account of it as 'process.' Practically speaking, Bakunin's conception was more correct since he saw that history must act through the heroic revolutionary rather than in spite of him. Marx equivocated here and thus the polarisation of Marxism into, and later its destruction by, reformism and Bolshevism (Leninism).

Unfortunately the history of Marx and Bakunin was partisan history and the full view could only be attained by a person willing to rise above this, to restore history as a pure process and the individual as hero. Such a man was the comparitively neglected Georges Sorel. Sorel had the good fortune to become a theoretician of socialism at the turn of the century. Thus he could see the decomposition of Marxism effected by the reformists yet was before the Jacobin experiment of Lenin. (When claimed to have influenced Lenin, he modestly disclaimed the honour). He saw clearly that it was the weakness, not the strength, of the rotting bourgeoisie which had turned the worker's movement into a reformist party. He saw that this degeneration was affecting the workers singly and in mass.

Sorel's aim was to restore the proletariat to their correct status, to their role as the historic, the hero class of the epoch. By hero class, Sorel understood the nordic concept of man against social forces beyond his control, man drawn into struggle, rather than the aristocratic "chevalier" concept of man searching for noble deeds to do.

The hero is made by circumstances: the proletariat's involvement in its tragic situation is inherent in its economic nature.

The way to restore it to and maintain it in its heroic stature, given the parliamentary reformist nature (by virtue of its moral cowardice) of the French bourgeoisie, was the encouragement of direct proletarian violence to stiffen the fibre of the bourgeoisie and to elevate the proletariat. The political expression of this was the encouragement of the Syndicalist movement.

DUNCAN DUNDONALD: SCOTTISH SYNDICALIST AND THE QUINTESSENCE OF ANARCHISM

(Being a spoof delivered as the First Annual Mikhail Bakunin Memorial Lecture 1967)

Duncan Dundonald was born in Glasgow in 1848, and was apprenticed at the age of eight in the Scotch shipbuilding industry. He was a member of the Scotch shipbuilding union when it affiliated with the International Alliance of Social Democracy in 1864,

the first date at which Bakuninism seems to have found a foothold in the English speaking world. In 1869, Dundonald met Nechaev and Bakunin in Geneva, and he later translated "The Catechism of a Revolutionist." After the First International Marxists deserted Bakuninism in 1872, Dundonald devoted himself to organizing syndicalism and destructionism in the Scottish engineering industry. After the Tay Bridge disaster, Dundonald fled Scotland for Australia, and Bakuninism slowly declined in Scotland, except for a militant faction in the shipyard which was later to be famous for building the "Titanic".

In Australia, Dundonald reversed his name to Donald Duncan, and continued organizing although handicapped by the need to remain anonymous. His best known works in Australia were the so-called "Great Fire of Melbourne" in 1898, and the Sunshine Railway Accident of 1908. Although growing old, Duncan gave considerable moral support to the Industrial Workers of the World, especially in the engineering and arsonist aspects.

His grandson at present rotting in prison has, as Anarchists realise, attempted to carry forward the Work.

The State as judge, moderator of social strife, impartial administrator of the public interests, is a lie, an illusion, a Utopia, never realized and never realizable. The question of putting an end to the exploitation of man by man is the question of putting an end to the coercive State. The question of Anarchism is thus the question of pacifism, the question of libertarianism, and finally the question of liberty. The contest between master and slave, governors and governed, action and inaction, and at last, existence and non-existence turn upon the preparedness of the oppressed in all regions to ignore all demands whatsoever placed upon them, to altogether revile every politician, policeman and priest, and to destroy all constraints, including especially every economic system, every monument of government, every den of private enterprise, every snivelling academic quisling who leads his students into any system of authority of any kind.

By contrast, Anarchy is the creative and constructive force of the people, who do not tolerate whatsoever any political upstart, landed proprietor, publisher, policemen and other fools who surrender to the demands of the political and economic power relationship. Power and relationship are not reconcilable to the cruel judgements of the people who reject such shoddy attempts to steal from them beyond their labour.

All institutions existing within whatsoever political and economic power relationship fall under the domination of an ambitious minority of politicians, pederasts, and publicists, and soon sycophancy throttles effectively any breathing which might have occurred. The Anarchist enquirer searches relentlessly for all institutions, organizations, and relationships of any kind and destroys these without relenting, acknowledging that the political and economic power relationship is the epitome, pattern, and archetype of all such attempts to deceive the people.

Anthropologists find all tribal customs, village communities and guilds whatsoever to be contemptible. We steal as far as possible all artifacts of these cheap attempts to disguise power behind any primitivist facade, whether in time or space, oceanic or medieval. We gleefully record and publish the taxonomy of objectives of all pitiful organizations by which those in power dupe the exploited. And finally we call upon all exploited to altogether regard the quest for status and power within any structure as contemptible, and pursue through any aims of food and sex as our brother Dundonald has done before us.

Moreover, do not believe that we are without clerical mandate, for all priests who do not unite wittingly with the universal struggle to enslave fellow men will unwittingly join our ranks. All schoolteachers will pursue the ideal of the total destruction within the classroom of all discipline, authority and instruction whatsoever, and call upon pupils to ignore resolutely all demands, most eminently his own. They may then freely, subject to whatever untainted winds that blow them, drift also towards food and sex.

All soldiers must divest themselves of uniform, donning clothes of skins, and mantles woven from reeds and the fronds of trees. Their guns and other machines of destruction will be gathered by the grateful people, who will convey them to regional destructionists who, following the example set by our brother, Michael Duncan, will set afire whatever building reeks before their nostrils with the stink

of authority. Fire brigades, abandon your hoses, let us turn them into the streets of the metropolis to wash from them the filth of the political and economic power relationship.

Yes, and what tramrides you shall have brethren! No tram shall come but that packed with happy people, rejecting all demands, travelling neither to the Sodom of Work nor the Gomorrah of Home. No priorities, no hierarchies, no sequences whatsoever of any kind will exist: their function exhausted.

Brothers and sisters, listen now to the deeds of Dundonald, behind whom people, birds and animals gathered as with his arrows of desire, he laid the ruins for the milennium of anarchy.

Can we not imagine the streets of the suburbs of this metropolis when Dundonald walked there with the throngs? There could not be fewer than five hundred people, and they were dancing like five thousand demons. They danced to a popular Anarchist song, keeping a ferocious time that was like a gnashing of the teeth in unison. They advanced, retreated, struck at one another's hands, clutched at one another's heads, spun round alone, caught one another, and spun round in pairs, until many of them dropped. Suddenly they stopped again, paused, struck out the time afresh, forming into lines the width of the street, and with their heads low down and their hands high up, swooped screaming off.

At the back of the rod, mightier than it, stands our obduracy. By degrees we get at what is at the back of the political and economic power relationship, and behind even that we find our ataraxy, imperturbability, our counter force, our odds of strength, our invincibility. Before that which formerly inspired in us fear and deference we no longer retreat shyly but ignore it. Back of everything we find our refusal to participate; at the back of authorities of whatsoever standing stands, after all, our immovable nonchalance or our outwitting shrewdness.

In the Houses of Parliaments, the temples of priestcraft, and the halls of learning the people erect their shrines of Venus, all politics, all economics, all power ignored. The marriage institution was their only weapon against the awakening of Woman. But in vain such frantic efforts to maintain a state of bondage. In vain, too, the edicts of priests, politicians and their academic subalterns. In vain the mad attacks of rulers, in vain the arm of the law. Woman no longer wants to be party to the production of a race of sickly, feeble, decrepit, wretched human beings, who have neither the strength nor the moral courage to throw off the yoke of the economic and political relationships of power.

Scientists agree to falsify their findings. Rather than let their formulas do the work of the captains of industry, they destroy the formulas: no car, tank or bomber shall move on the fuel of our white-coated brothers. The scales of the petty shopkeeper shall be corrupted, and to all shall be given an abundance of food until the warehouses are empty, and the silos have released from captivity the last grain of wheat. All who craved power are laughed at, the bitter acid of jests and ridicule render their pretensions impotent. Universal spontaneity replaces totalitarian regimentation. Dundonald is revered by all, listened to by none. Authority is dead.

INFORMATION SHEET OF: THE REVOLUTIONARY EMANCIPISTS AGAINST STATE OPPRESSION AND NATIONALISM. (TREASON) (1967)

TREASON members are, or should be, distinguished from the majority of the community and from members of other clubs in that they hold a wide variety of reasoned opinions with respect to various social, economic, political, moral and religious questions. There is, in TREASON, no pressure to conformity with a single set of responses to these.

War and Violence:

On this question anarchists, pacifists and libertarians generally agree although there are still some violent anarchists - that is, theoretical supporters of revolution. Otherwise all are united against war; but for different reasons. Some pacifists

and anarchists oppose war because of its corrupting influence and the general moral paucity of the reasons for which wars are started and the actions to which they lead. Some also subscribe to the "brotherhood of man" which entails that you can't do anything final in your punishment of the enemy - that is, kill him. Another argument in this vein is that the wrong people are always killed - e.g. the civilians in Hamburg - although this is logically independent. Absolutists of both schools may argue for the supreme sanctity of human life.

A traditional argument of anarchists, and originally of Marxists, is that of "international solidarity of the proletariat" - that the real enemy is the home front capitalist (or bureaucrat) and that the only loser is the proletariat in all ways. Libertarians, due to peculiarities of their ethical and social theories, do not feel any obligation to help any government; regard any war as correlated with certain interest groups and are opposed in their theory to compulsion. It would be unusual, however, to find a TREASON member being a pacifist on religious grounds alone.

Ethics:

In this realm certain differences arise which distinguish anarchists, who are generally moral, from libertarians who are nearly always amoral. The first point is whether every morality is ideological. In this connection, 'ideology' means a system of strictly meaningless propositions which are believed to be true (by some), but which have the actual function of serving some social, economic or political interest. Libertarians hold that all moralities are ideological and that all ethical propositions are meaningless. Anarchists, except some Christian ones, hold that all moralities are ideological, but few wish to do away with all ethical propositions. Religious anarchists may want to say that the few basic moral precepts that they keep are God's law (or Gods' law) but this leaves the question of the precedence of law and right. If they are God's law because they are right, then there is little objection; if they are right because they are God's law then the anarchist is committed to anti-theism.

(It should be pointed out that anarchists and libertarians are against the law; they have a social (un-moral) theory of crime, they point out the independence of law and right, and they attack the definite class character (or state character) of penal codes). The anarchists who are not religious either adhere to forms of utilitarianism, to personal intuition or to a sort of natural law or morality which they find emergent in the increasing sociability of man through history. Various positions are hence advanced in the discussion of free love - a bread and butter argument for anarchists and libertarians.

Free Love:

The traditional position is that 'love is born free', that is, that the facts of sexual involvement demand that they be not tied to any single system, that nothing be formalised and that (mutual) desire be allowed free reign.

Sometimes this becomes a position covering the instinctual anarchism of 'freedom-worship' - that is, the state of mind that sees nothing higher than personal freedom and refuses all ties and all actual or potential restraints. This social position is only rarely, if ever, connected with the positions being discussed which are basically intellectual. Some argue that monogamy (or promiscuity) is most natural, but this cannot be used as a ground of criticism as libertarians say that it is meaningless. They hold to a position rather like the first one in that they recognise a plurality of possible, equally valid approaches, but in general regard it as self-obligatory to some extent to choose the best sexual life and regard this usually as relative monogamies interspersed with promiscuities.

Social Theory:

Another divergence crisis between anarchists and libertarians is to be found in their analysis of society. Briefly it is that the latter consider anarchist theory to be false. Libertarian social theory is pluralistic; i.e. they start from the premise that in any society there are numbers of groups with different and often conflicting views and interests. It follows from this that solidarist concepts, e.g. 'State', 'Society', 'Party', are really covers for particular, relatively homogeneous

subgroups. Because libertarians as such are classless, they do not have any explicit ideology to justify themselves, nor do they wish to. They claim to have anti-authoritarian preferences, but do not see these as embodied in any group or movement, whereas anarchists usually do. For this reason, they have no interest in the future society (or the future of society) and concentrate on the struggle against authoritarian forces here and now.

They see all revolutionary and reformist movements as doomed to bureaucratic degeneration and see the struggle against authoritarianism as never-ending. Anarchist social theory is not totally pluralistic, but is dialectic. That is, it sees society in a state of struggle between opposing sets of forces embodied in socially distinguishable groups (for example, Capital and Labour, Government and People, Leaders and Rank-and-file). It generally sees these conflicts as resolvable. Organisationally, anarchists believe that no-one should be allowed permanent assumption of power, and that this be resolved by rotation of citizens in these positions.

WHAT IS THE ANARCHIST POSITION? (1968)

Etymologically '~~an~~archy' just means 'without a ruler', however the anarchist position has generally been that not only is such a society possible but that the state is a vehicle for exploitation and oppression. Can this position be justified?

(a) The state has service aspects, i.e. it performs specific social functions. The question here is whether here is whether a social function necessarily involves the idea of abstract, i.e. state, power. The state is an abstract power because it has 'powers' which are not for a specific purpose (whether or not the state power is constitutionally limited the powers it has are of indefinite extent).

Furthermore its 'powers' are not rooted in any free consensus as are, say, the powers of a sporting association.

(b) The state enforces a certain social consensus as law but this law is not made by the people but in its name. Thus the state inhibits social plurality - a pre-condition for individual freedom.

(c) Even if states are not automatically expansionary the existence of most governments seems to be connected with the "existence" of an internal or external threat - a threat to the state or ruling classes. States seem to have an indissoluble connection with war.

(d) Insofar as the state or government bureaucracy supports or maintains itself the organisation of industry into large hierarchical units - hierarchical in personnel rather than necessary function - the state is an instrument of exploitation regardless of whether it is capitalist or collectivist. In particular rewards go to authority rather than to competence or knowledge i.e. a decision may be in effect made by a specialist but it is promulgated by a bureaucrat (who gets more money). Although intermediaries appear necessary it seems that authoritarian-bureaucratic organisations use many more than necessary and indeed have ones which are effectively not intermediaries.

A boss is an apex: unless he contributes some special competence he is unnecessary.

Assuming that a minimal bureaucracy is set up to handle essential social functions won't this be connected with a hierarchical organisation of society and won't it too have abstract power?

(a) If we assume that, as in most countries, it is a closed bureaucracy then the public have no effective rights against it. A closed bureaucracy has no roots in local life and so cannot easily discern the needs of the community. Since 'bureaucracy' means the execution of formal rules the local existence of its operatives does not affect their performance except

insofar as they pervert its operation and short-cut the red tape. Nor can the local community make direct (i.e. other than through the bureaucratic channels) representation to the policy-determining body. It follows that an efficient service bureaucracy would have to fuse with local bodies at the local level. Its lower rung would be community organisations rather than branch offices.

(b) A bureaucracy only gives the right of decision to a very few and the right to be heard to a slightly larger number. It is the special province of its bureaucrats even if it is not the weapon of a government. These will not be informed on all issues but they resent interference from outside and at most confer with the bureaucrats from other bureaucracies. Thus representation of interests wider than purely local ones is also impaired. Thus there must be a channel for extra information - both statistics and demands - at all decision levels. There must be guaranteed access for social organisations and the right to form new interest groups able to be heard and to influence decisions.

(c) Finally even given this democratization the employees of the bureaucracy are also citizens and are likely from their position to have special information. Hence there is a duty to hear their views - i.e. the views of the ranks as opposed to the views of the higher levels - and to allow them access to even more information. There must be a vigorous organisation of the operatives with its own information, system. The granting of the right of initiative and information to the operatives destroys the bureaucratic structure completely. What remains is a sort of union with links to other local organisations and unions. The performance of essential social functions does not need a bureaucratic organisation.

What of "revolutionary government?"

(a) While the bulk of the case against the state does not apply to "Provisional" governments, the argument against bureaucracy does with added strength. Because of its experience a bureaucratic organisation with a tradition is at least partially functional since it has usually had organic growth from a smaller unbureaucratic organisation. The attempt - as in Russia in 1918 - to create afresh a large bureaucracy with little social basis and with inexperienced operatives is certain to be dysfunctional. If one is created using the older operatives it will probably be the same bureaucracy (as the Russian ones tended to become.) Thus the service and social aspects of government should be built up from below by federations of local organs and interest groups creating their own administration and using elements from the old bureaucracies controlled from below if necessary.

(b) Certainly federal revolutionary bodies must exist to exchange views and information as well as to suggest policies to the public. But this is not a government. In a revolution - and almost by definition - the people act, actions are not made in their names. To exist a government needs to assimilate to itself the new social organisations and so distorts the growth of the popular revolutionary organs. Such a distorted growth is dysfunctional since the popular organs grow in response to public needs and demands.

The replacement of the independent sources of revolutionary power by the state government makes for compromise and provides a visible target for the counter-revolution. It also makes any mistake more serious since the revolutionary government by necessity considers itself beyond criticism and its power is incomparably greater than that of any individual revolutionary organ. On the other hand if all revolutionary organs have a social function there will not be the scope for violence to fellow revolutionaries or to anyone else. The tendency of a revolutionary government is towards the government of bureaucratic arrogance: government by propaganda, terror and demagoguery. This course is not open to individual social-revolutionary organs.

A SHORT HISTORY OF TREASON (1968)

The spontaneous formation of Treason was publicly announced in the following letter to Farrago on Friday, May 6th, 1966..

Dear Comrade,

We wish to announce the inauguration of TREASON - The Revolutionary Emancipists Against State Oppression and Nationalism. We have a world wide membership - in the name of individuality and freedom resolute in its resistance to oppression as inhibitive of freedom and nationalism as a cause of war.

On Open-Day, local representatives will man on information booth in Wilson Hall to reveal to the peoples their true cause of discontent.

In this venture, TREASON is supported by two million Vietnamese peasants, Socrates, 20,000 Parisian citizens, Bruno, all Christian martyrs, Turkish victims of the Crusades, Servetus, one million dead Spaniards, 100,000 Ukranians, six million Jews, 150,000 victims of Nagasaki and Hiroshima, Sacco, and Vanzetti, Hus, Cranmer and all other individuals and groups availing themselves of the abundant opportunities for martyrdom, graciously supplied by the Government and States.

Yours for imminent insurrection,

John V. Paull,
Andrew G. Peters.

The eruption of TREASON was also announced in the national daily "The Australian" shortly afterwards on the Martin Collins page.

Members set up an open revolutionary committee and one of its first acts was to send $4 to the victims of the Italian floods.

For the visit of a notorious American on the last day of third term 1966, TREASON produced 1,000 badges with the slogan "Defeat U.S. Cultural Aggression", which sold out in twenty-four hours. Treason members were prominent among those organising the demonstrations which unfortunately flopped due to lack of co-ordination of other organisers. However, some Treason members were able to witness police state methods outside Government House the same night. Members were also prominent downtown during the exams, distributing "Facts About the Anti-LBJ Demonstrations."

In Orientation Week 1967 Treason had a stand enabling many new members to join. Also an address was given by Mr. Ron Silverstein on the Crimes Act - the talk be illustrated with completely incomprehensible diagrams.

On open day, Treason also created a display which made an impression on many visitors. The badge "I AM AN ENEMY OF THE STATE" had been produced and was distributed to the masses.

The next task was organising a team for the SCHAES Trike Race - held at the end of first term. A team of two cars and seven people ten minutes before the race grew to six cars and more than twenty people in five minutes. TREASON performed magnificently completing the sixty miles from Portsea to Parkville despite mechanical damage and internal factions. The eighty-ninth anniversary of the death of Russian Anarchist - Mikhail Alexandrovitch Bakunin - was celebrated early in second term by Bakunin Week.

Bakunin Week activities commenced on Monday, 3rd July at 5.18 a.m. at the South Melbourne tram depot. Here comrades gathered with placards in six languages to greet our friends abroad in the world-wide television show "Our World". However, due to avoidance of us by the ABC, in fact political censorship, we were unable to communicate our messages around the world.

Unarmed with Bakunin's philosophy, "The desire to destroy can also be a creative desire", members continued their creative activities during Bakunin week, ending with the Bakunin party under the black flag.

Later in the term, the first annual Mikhail Alexandrovitch Bakunin memorial lecture delivered by Mr. Peter Thomson of the department of Sociology. His topic was "Duncan Dundonald - Scottish Syndicalist and The Quintessence of Anarchism".

Early in third term, the first annual Prince Peter Kropotkin memorial lecture was delivered by Mr. Paddy Evans on the topic "On Student Poverty". This talk was well attended by history and social work students, and the press. For the remainder of the year, Treason evolved into factions, with rival factions producing their own newsheets - Contumacy and Stateless. Unfortunately the rivalry has disintegrated as the Contumacy faction has sought self-exile in Tasmania.

This year, among other activities, Treason hopes to inaugurate memorial lectures remembering Monty Miller, Molly Maguire, Pierre Joseph Proudhon, "Big" Bill Haywood, Eugene V. Debs, Albert Parsons, Enrico Malatesta, Joe Hill and others, produce revolutionary theories on education, present correct accounts of history, particularly where it has been distorted by marxists, communists and their stooges, and capitalists, and promote opposition to oppression, suppression and agression practised by politicians and other authoritarians.

HO FOR THE MERRY MONTH OF MAY! (1968)

On Sunday May 5, TREASON members marched with the Melbourne Anarchist Group, the Wobblies, the Spanish syndicalists and the FAI-CNT in what is known as the Annual May Day march. Also marching were unions and students.

Firstly it must be realised that the march is not held on May Day - the first of May. Workers in most western countries have been bludgeoned into having the march on the first Sunday of May - a day one notes on which production will not be affected. Thus only a small part of the working class marches on the Sunday and none at all on May Day - they work. So on Sunday the unions with their decorated floats with the stale old placards about Vietnam, peace, solidarity, workers must unite etc. were there. So were the students. The Monash Labour Club, carrying NLF flags, chanted 'Ho, Ho, Ho Chi Minh' in a rather sickening manner, no doubt they think that "Uncle Ho" (sic) is the new saviour.

The Spaniards were by far the best and most colourful group there. With their anti-Franco, anti-fascist, pro-liberty, pro-syndicalist banners and the red, yellow and purple flag of the Republic, they were very impressive. Marching with them was TREASON with black anarchist flags, red and black syndicalist flags and IWW (Industrial Workers of the World) signs. Leading was the Melbourne Anarchist Group truck with banners calling for Workers Control, saying 'NEITHER HANOI, NOR WASHINGTON' and depicting fat capitalists on the backs of workers.

For the first time the march ended at the Music Bowl and not at the traditional Yarra Bank. This indicated another step in the degeneration of the Unions. Were we to hear exciting speeches filled with new ideas about Workers Control of Industry, more use of Direct Action in industrial disputes, refusal to support conscription and the war effort, the use of sabotage against tyrannical capitalists? No! Instead we had a concert in which we were entertained by the Combined Pensioners Association and folk singers. The only talk was by Bert Nolan of the Seamens Union. In tracing the history of May Day and the Eight Hour Movement, he almost completely ignored the part played by the Chicago anarchists in 1886. Instead he said the same old crap about Vietnam, working hours, equal pay, wages etc. In other words he advocated compromise with the capitalist bureaucracy. What workers today should realise is that if they want anything whether it is equal pay for women or shorter working hours, they will get it a bloody lot quicker by direct action than by wasting time, money and effort in the Arbitration Court.

After this display, one wonders if the Trade Union movement in Australia has any future. Apparently the union leaders are worried about the lack of enthusiasm shown by young workers. This is not surprising, but they try to win them with

folk music. But this can be heard any day of the year. May Day comes once a year. The only way to win young workers for the unions is by action.

What is needed in the trade unions is a resurgence of the rank and file. Removal of leaders who no longer represent the interests of the class is essential. Its no use talking merely of wage increases and shorter hours. The capitalists and government are not going to give workers anything if it affects them (the bureaucrats). And remember, how many members of the arbitration commission are members of the working class? None. They are employed by the government which represents the interests of capitalism, and paid large salaries by the government.

The rank and file must move towards their own control of their work. They can no longer afford to be merely "hired labour". They who produce should reap the benefits, not those who happen to be loaded with money and can buy shares and collect from the sweat of the workers. Dispute between workers and management must be acted on by the rank and file on the spot - not left to those who sit in offices and are generally swayed by the bosses and the press. (In this respect, the way that the Postal workers defied the ACTU was tremendous, and it is a pity that they did not strike a little longer). The goal of the rank and file is to get rid of capitalist exploitation and theft - remember every time the workers get a wage increase, up go the prices, which nullifies the benefit of the increase and makes things worse for those on fixed incomes, e.g. pensioners.

So the May Day march and display of solidarity, for what it is worth, is a farce in Melbourne. It might as well not be held. In future it should be held on the first, and every worker should take to the streets. Close down industry for a day! It won't hurt the workers, and with such a display of solidarity the bosses might be more inclined to listen.

CZECHOSLOVAKIA (1968)

While it is impossible to produce reporting or analysis comparable with that of the recent "CLASS on Czechoslovakia" the anarchists felt that something further should said.

Firstly the invasion is a failure of Marxism .... When the Second International collapsed in 1914 Lenin and his ultra-Leftist friends were able to put it down to the non-marxism of the revisionists. In 1968 are the Western Communists prepared to take the same course with the Russian Marxist-Leninists? One could now say that socialism has been betrayed by Marxists of all shades but this would be to confuse the issue. It is not that Marxists are weak and capitulationist or evil and Stalinist, it is simply that if you start off by glorifying the state and the dictatorship of the proletariat you end up thinking that your state is more important than another. Wars are fought for various forms for various reasons: most are fought by states for reasons of state. Czechoslovalia confirms that the Marxist analysis (paltry as it was) of the relationship between the state and socialism was inadequate - Bakunin pointed this out a century ago.

Secondly there is nothing that socialist outside the East European Bloc can do. When the communist parties had a formal association they could have withdrawn dramatically and set up a new one without Russian and her allies (not that they would even today). Today they serve Russia to a lesser extent and in a far more informal manner - they cannot make an obvious break with Moscow without embracing China to underline their change.

Thirdly the Australian left will probably benefit from the invasion rather than the converse. The demands of being anti-Russian have led the newspapers to make heroes out of assorted Czech communist, represent the population as solidly behind liberal communist (they probably are) and to give wide publicity to the CPA and its disagreement with the Russian actions. If it had gone on much longer the government would have started criticizing the newspapers.

Fourthly, an Australian communist said in 1948 or thereabouts that if the Red Army came to Australia it would be the duty of the working class (i.e. communists) to

help them. Have there been any new thoughts since then?

Another View

While "the left" marched through Melbourne chanting "Dubcek, Dubcek, Ho Chi Minh", the North Vietnamese unequivocably supported the Russians in their action to protect socialism in Czechosovakia. While the left, particularly the Western Communist parties,argues about socialism, the Russian brand of socialism.

Surely socialism requires that the state look after all citizens and provide full employment, even for the dregs of society. Russia provides this employment - secret police, political commissionars, apparatchiks -and thus serves the down trodden. It is only trying to extend this social security into Czechoslovakia.

The implied similarity between Dubcek and Ho Chi Minh is absurd. By winning maneouvres inside the Czech and Slovak communist parties, Dubcek opened 'the way for new ideas, criticism and quietly kicked down stairs Novotny and his thugs (in fact, the Ho Chi Minhs of Czechoslovakia). When Ho established the Viet Minh united front, he frequently purged those deviationists from the Marxist-Leninist line - either liquidating them or selling them to the French. When the Vietnamese Novotny established a government in North Vietnam, the remainder of the non-communists were disposed of.

Meanwhile the Vietnam war drags on, three thousand Biafrans die each day, Israel and the Arabs continue their own little war, Mexican students rebel, thousand of Persians die in an earthquake . . . . . .

ON THE RIGHT OF CERTAIN COMRADES TO CARRY RED-AND-BLACK FLAGS (1969)

Today I received a newspaper photo of Queensland's Brian Laver marching under a red and black flag and a letter which stated that the marchers sounded just like the Monash Labour Club at the May Day March last year. It would be nice to think that this was just a case of left groups shelving their differences in order to get something done, but such is not the case. What the anarchist flags amongst the NLF flags signify is not co-operation but an unhealthy confusion of a type to which the younger New Left (or with Doug Kirsner "the Young Left") seems peculiarly prone. Their concern for freedom leads by a peculiar romantic logic to a fanatical and uncritical support for National Liberation movements. This may be alright in the context of the USA or Australia at the present time because it opposes official patriotism with a more or less idealistic internationalism, but I do not think it can be otherwise justified. It must be remembered that "National Liberation" does not imply freedom for the individual, let alone control over his own destiny; but the New Left has claimed that these are its political aims. Surely the historical left would have had nothing to do with a "Democratic Republic" (a bourgeois name for a worse than bourgepis reality). They at least needed to be persuaded that Russia was a "federation of Soviets" before they closed their eyes and supported Stalin. Today's left would be much easier to seduce.

The demand for a new morality, for new type of person, becomes confused with the campaigns by the Cubans and the Chinese (and if you accept these, then ultimately the Russians as well) for the new socialist man: the campaign for the perfect citizen of the all-pervading State. The view held by these rulers is essentially that the masses are plasticine to be molded by the ruling elite. This is a possible view but it is as far from anarchism and humanist socialism as it is from marxism or classical democracy. In particular it is a view that, in its American forms, the New Left have sworn to oppose.

At present the New Left at Melbourne are handing out the Program of the NLF'SV. Except for the words "fascist" and "imperialist" it could have been written in 1848, indeed it has some decidedly reactionary bits and is national-patriotic in wording. It supports the national bourgeois and mentions neither collectivisation, nationalisation or (most importantly for a genuine New Left) workers control. The only conclusion you can come to is that they don't mean it. But what do they mean? How can you seriously support people who won't tell you what they are after? (And "communism" is not a good answer).

HIGH STRIKES! (1969)

The battle being waged by the Education Dept., the VSTA, the VTU and the Headmasters association over the qualifications issue is rather nauseating. Over recent years the Department has adequately demonstrated its incompetence, but the VSTA's late effort is rather pathetic. The VSTA seems to have divine faith in the letters Dip. Ed. and TSTC. As if one years training, in the first case involving a lot of theoretical nonsense, and in the second case the study of damaging authoritarian teaching methods, produces teachers who are significantly better than those who have not taken these courses.

It can be argued that having no teacher is better than having a bad teacher, or as the VSTA would argue, no teacher is better than an unqualified teacher. But those who can decide whether a teacher is good (qualified) or bad (unqualified) have not been asked. They will not be. They are the school children who are obviously in the best position to judge.

But in the war of words waged by the Department and the VSTA the schoolchildren seem forgotten. It is time that the Department did something that would help rather than hinder education e.g. abolish its own centralised, authoritarian control of education; and the VSTA should concentrate on trying to implement schemes that would improve the quality of teachers rather than having "qualification hunts". Meanwhile let the kids decide who they want to teach them.

Treason Editor's Comment:

The causes of teacher militancy should be sought in the increasingly "trade union" character of their associations. As we all know teaching is poorly regarded as a profession by the public at large and its practitioners. The people who teach are those who miss out on the Scholarships and/or do pass degrees especially in Arts. The attempt to force a certain exclusiveness onto the teaching profession is, of course, not so much an attempt to raise the actual standards as to raise the standing of teachers as professionals in precisely the same way as the system of guilds and apprenticeships raised the social standing of artisan callings in early capitalist times. An effect of this may, of course, be that better people go into teaching but it does not seem that excessive intelligence is required so much as the personality for getting the uninspired material across.

ON THE NLF: THOSE TEN POINTS (1969)

The N.L.F.'s ten points as printed in a recent S.D.S. newsheet - Vietnam Peace Proposals - require some comment, particularly because of the N.L.F.'s claim that they are peace proposals.

Points one to three reiterate what the N.L.F. has been saying for years, viz that the U.S. must get out of Vietnam completely, leaving it to the Vietnamese. Will this lead to a subsequent N.L.F. and hence communist takeover of South Vietnam? Apparently not. Point four tells us that the South Vietnamese will be able to take part in democratic elections and select a coalition government. Politically, this is exactly what has been condemned in capitalist society, by much of the left over the past few years. Has the N.L.F. been fighting for ten years just so that it can take part in democratic elections? What about its revolutionary characteristics that the left in western countries has told us so much about? What happens to the mass of South Vietnamese who have been supporting the N.L.F. for the past decade? - sold down the river by democratic elections. Point four reads as if the N.L.F. is prepared to collaborate with the reactionary and corrupt politicians in Saigon. Point five elaborates on the formation of a provisional coalition government. But, as Saigon and the N.L.F. won't talk to each other in Paris, it is hardly likely that they will get together to form a government if the U.S. withdraws its troops unconditionally. If this should happen, an N.L.F. victory, both militarily and politically, is likely. This would be followed by an N.L.F. government (possibly including people outside the N.L.F.) which eventually must lead to a communist takeover. There is no force in South Vietnam which is politically viable apart from the communists. The Thieu government would collapse without U.S. support. As for the other noncommunists, whether inside or outside the N.L.F., they are neither sufficiently organised nor

strong enough to defeat the communists politically. If the N.L.F. is prepared to take part in a provisional government it would be only as a prelude to a communist takeover.

Let us now consider point six. The N.L.F. says that South Vietnam will "establish diplomatic, economic and cultural relations with all countries irrespective of political and social regime including the U.S.". Setting aside the fact that the N.L.F. is deciding South Vietnam's foreign policy before being elected, does this also include South Africa, Rhodesia, Spain, Portugal, Bolivia.....

Point seven states that the reunification of Vietnam will be achieved peacefully by discussions and agreement between the north and south zones of Vietnam. This implies that the majority of people in South Vietnam are in favour of reunification with the north. How can this be known at the present time? Vietnam has been divided for fifteen years. It is just not known if a majority of South Vietnamese would want to live under the same regime as the North Vietnamese. Ho Chi Minh, of course is waiting for the day when his communist regime dominates the whole of Vietnam.

A reading of point eight reveals that neither North Vietnam nor South Vietnam would join any foreign military alliance. In the event of a U.S. withdrawal there are not likely to be any foreign alliances formed. The North Vietnamese and South Vietnamese do not need them. However, will the reported 80,000 Chinese troops in North Vietnam then go home? Points nine and ten do not require comment as they deal only with the aftermath of the war; the withdrawal of U.S. and other foreign troops, payment of war damages by the U.S. and the release of prisoners on both sides.

While anarchists are extremely critical of the N.L.F. and North Vietnam, they realise that a large proportion of the blame for the Vietnam war rests with U.S. The solution for peace in South Vietnam does not lie in one imposed by the U.S. as the American government now realises. Nor does it lie in a solution imposed by the N.L.F., coalition governments or any other of the so-called peace proposals that are talked across the table in Paris. Peace in South Vietnam will come when the people reject all authoritarian regimes no matter where they are imposed from and take to organising their own lives in the way they did in the late 1950's when Diem started his political persecutions of the people, particularly in the countryside, and before the communists captured control of the resistance movement. However, the people of South Vietnam have been battered from all sides and no matter what happens at the Paris peace talks, it appears inevitable that there can only be one result - a communist controlled South Vietnam.

ON WORKERS' CONTROL 1 (1969)

The importance of the current revival of interest in "workers' control" is that it is a concept which could give rise to a movement synthesising the viewpoints of the marxists and anarcho-syndicalists and involving wider circles of workers than any purely political movement could.

If this is to happen however there will have to be some clarity as to what is meant by 'workers' control'. Within the movement defined by the term there seems to be three quite divergent positions. These are:

1) workers' control as a defensive concept,

2) workers' control as an aggressive concept, and

3) workers' control as a method of organising society.

The first position is exemplified by Jack Hutson in an article in Australian Left Review, No. 1., 1969. He conceives workers' control as an 'ideological counter-offensive against capitalist control' and as 'an extension of the right of Trade Unions particularly in the workshops, through their representatives, to have an effective say in decisions made in respect to such matters as trade unionism, safety, welfare, discipline, wage fixation, appointment of supervisory staff, deployment of

labour, technological changes, hiring and firing and access to financial records.'

This amounts to control by the workers over the immediate job environment, a limited control over the longer-term environment and a limited right of information. However radical a change this would be for Australia it remains a reformist demand in that it has largely been achieved at various times overseas without necessarily being part of a socialist offensive against capitalism. In West Germany trade unionists sit on the boards of directors in mining and steel concerns and have a large say in the appointment of personnel managers but this is participation rather than workers' control. A very real pre-requisite for workers' control is the abolition of supervisory staff and direct worker self-management on the shop floor.

In this defensive sense the word 'control' is a misnomer and what is really meant is a check on the absolute power of the capitalist - or state appointed manager - in his own enterprise. A similar interpretation was adopted by Lenin between 1917 and 1919 as a measure during the period of "dual power". In his conception the right of information was primary since his aim was to prevent capitalists from sabotaging the economy. But to understand workers' control as an aggressive concept it is necessary to turn from Lenin to the Russian workers.

Following the March revolution workers acting in the name of local soviets began seizing engineers and expelling unpopular foremen. In June the executive committee of the Soviets advised all industrial workers to 'create councils at the enterprises, the control embracing not only the course of work at the enterprise itself, but the entire financial side of the enterprise.' Inspection of all financial matters was also being undertaken at this time. In October coal miners seized control of the mines. Most such actions were undertaken by the workers on the spot rather than by the soviets.

After the bolsheviks came to power they decided on the limited conception of worker control discussed above (and only later were forced to change to state ownership). Notwithstanding this many factory committees went beyond the Decree on Worker Control (sic) and took administration into their own hands. Of firms "nationalised" before June 1918 one hundred were nationalised by decree and four hundred "illegally" seized by the workers.

This aggressive and revolutionary conception of workers control comes naturally to the working class in periods of revolutionary crisis if the unions have remainded autonomous or if autonomous workers' councils can be set up. A consideration of the events of 1917 in Russia, 1919-20 in Italy, 1936 in Spain, 1956 in Hungary and 1968 in France lead to the conclusion that there is a spontaneous syndicalism of the working class and that the characteristic form of revolution in an industrial environment is the imposition of direct worker control. (Although this did not happen in France the factory occupations were a step in that direction and it was the CP-controlled unions that stopped the movement foreward. Similarly in Germany in 1918 both unions and councils were dominated by the socialist party and a specifically industrial power struggle could not develop). This fact has certainly been recognised hitherto but it has never been encouraged. However if there is to be a socialist revolution this spontaneous syndicalism will have to be linked with the conception of worker control as a mode of social organisation, i.e. self-management. This latter conception is at once both old and new.

In the past it was fundamental to guild socialism, anarchism and syndicalism; today it reappears in the writings of East European humanist socialists and in far left western revolutionary thought. It is on its basis that the conflicting currents of the classical workers' movement can be reunited.

THE QUINTESSENCE OF BUREAUCRACY (1969)

I have just heard a news item which told of a man who was gaoled for three months for the 'crime' of stealing eleven pairs of pantihouse from a large Melbourne store. And in the Broadmeadows court on Thursday July 10, seventeen parents were each fined $4 on the charge of having failed to cause their children to attend school (The Sun 18/7/69).

Both decisions characterise the stupidity and waste of the legal system. The first case-a ridiculously large penalty for a trivial 'crime'; the second case-a small penalty for an offense which illustrates the authoritarian mentality of the education department. The S.M. in this case, Mr. R. K. Huspeth, told one of the defendants - "I know it isn't easy. There are ways. If my kids stopped home, I know what I would do with them. They wouldn't do it again." Children stay away from school probably because of the repressive, antieducational tendencies of our educational system. Mr. Huspeth's comments imply that the solution for truancy is for parents to use brutality on their children in order to force them to attend school.

Meanwhile time, money are wasted on courts as the education department implements the law requiring compulsory school attendance for all children less than fifteen years old. And the man in the first case mentioned, the convicted man loses three months of his life in prison (at considerable expense to the State), because a bureaucrat (the S.M.) was feeling particularly strict. Surely, even in a capitalist society it would be more logical to let the man continue to work so that he could pay for the stolen goods. But the mind of a bureaucrat does not usually think in humane or logical terms.

From 8.45A.M. to 5.06P.M. (or similar), the bureaucrat functions. He is not concerned with human problems-he is concerned with executing orders from above, balancing books, maintaining files and records, etc, etc., The officers of the housing commission who are trying to evict people out of their homes in Carlton, are not expected to worry about the feelings of the tenants or the historical value of the houses to be demolished. The bureaucrats at the housing commission aren't in danger of losing their homes. The gas and fuel corporation clerk who orders the cutting off of gas to a house because of an unpaid bill does not bother to discover that the breadwinner of the home is unemployed (due to circumstances beyond his control), and his wife has one or more sick children to care for, The labor exchange official who offers an unemployed man a basic wage job twenty miles from his home, does not worry about the high cost of fares and cancels the worker's unemployment benefits if he refuses to accept the job. The officers of the social services department who hound pensioners suspected of earning more money than allowed by law, do not stop to ask the pensioner if he has enough to eat.

Every day, politicians, public servants, judges, magistrates, police and departmental investigators are responsible for injustices, both large and small. This will continue to be so for as long as we live under the rule of the State. The State is not concerned with people; it is concerned with its own (efficient or not) maintenance. For this it requires the existence of bureaucrats, who do not let issues like poverty, ill-health, misery, aesthetics and practicality interfere with objective judgements and wise decisions. While a bureaucrat is on the job he is not corrupted by human emotions; he has his job to do.

ON THE CORRECT HANDLING OF DEFENCE DEPARTMENT RECRUITERS (1969)

Before there is a half-baked demonstration against the visit of the Defence Department recruiters, it is necessary to state some principles relevant to the visit.

1) Knowledge of Defence Department structure and activities is not widely diffused. Therefore it is your intellectual right to ask for an appointment with the recruiters to remedy this lack, and to inform yourself about job opportunities.

2) If any dialogue with the Defence Department is to be achieved, or if the recruiters are to be required to explain their justification for anything at all, then this must be done by interested people making an appointment with the recruiters.

So, comrades, we suggest that you go to your interviews prepared to listen patiently while the department is explained, and then to distinguish yourselves by searching and intelligent questioning. It is very easy to take the wrong attitude to government and military bodies, and to accuse all associated with them of crimes that they could not possibly have committed, and thus to alienate possible potential

support. Mr. Ian McIvor of S.D.S. calls for the removal of the University Regiment (M.U.R.) - let it be remembered that this regiment has destroyed an army tank by mortar fire and mislaid a Bofors anti-aircraft gun. Will Mr. McIvor or any of the Melbourne University Left rise to such heights of revolutionary ardour? And remember many M.U.R. members are draft-dodgers.

Students of all faculties are welcome at the Defence Department interviews. See how friendly they are. Appointments can still be made at the Appointments Board or by ringing the University Extension 734 for next Monday or Tuesday.

PLAIN ANARCHISM, MARXIST ANARCHISM AND ANARCHIST MARXISM.

Part 1. Bakunin and Marx (1969)

A major source of tension between anarchists and left socialists is the latter's misapprehension of the relation between anarchism and marxism. While it may be remembered that Marx wrote "The Poverty of Philosophy" as a reply to Proudhon's "Philosophy of Poverty", it is more rarely remembered that Bakunin was the first person to attempt to translate "Das Kapital" into Russian. Similarly, nearly every leftist knows that Plekhanov wrote "Anarchism and Socialism" - an attack on Russian anarchism - but how many know that at the time he converted Plekhanov to socialism (i.e. anarchism), Axelrod himself was an anarchist. (Essentially his position was not changed when he called himself a marxist).

The attitude of the anarchists in the first international (I.W.M.A.) is the real indicator of the difference between marxism and anarchism. There, the two parties clashed (in a milieu of somewhat mystified trade unionists) over three issues. These were -

1. the role of "parties" in the revolution;

2. the state after the revolution;

3. the abolition of inheritance.

Taking these in reverse order may surprise the modern reader. The two parties were agreed on abolition of inheritance but the bakunists insisted on adopting it as a plank of the platform of the international, whereas the marxists claimed that it would follow naturally from a socialist revolution. (In Russia it was necessary to introduce a law abolishing inheritance after a few years of experimentation.) On the other two points the differences were more serious.

On the nature of the state after the revolution, the argument was over the forms of worker power. The anarchists wanted worker direct democracy (direct "dictatorship of the proletariat"), but the marxists wanted a dictatorship of a party 'representing' the working class. Countering the marxist demand for a party dictatorship over the workers (c.f. Engels' idea of subjecting the workers to a very strong government-letter to Carlo Caffiero), the anarchists pointed to the possibility of bureaucratic degeneration and the likelihood of the bureaucracy becoming a special social interest in its own right. (The theory of the 'new class' was discovered many times by anarchists and alienated working class socialists before Djilas enunciated it.

Compare the following quotations:

"There will therefore be no longer any priveleged class, but there will be government, and note this well, an extremely complex government, which will not comfort itself with governing and administrating the masses politically, but which will also administer them economically, concentrating in its own hands the production and just division of wealth, the cultivation of land, the establishment and development of factories, the organisation and direction of commerce, finally the application of capital to production by the only broker, the State. All that will demand an immense knowledge and many 'heads overflowing with brains' in this government. It will be the reign of scientific intelligence, the most aristocratic, despotic, arrogant and contemptous of all regimes. There will be a new hierachy of real and

pretended scholars and scientists, and the world will be divided into a minority ruling in the name of knowledge and an immense ignorant majority. And then, woe betide the mass of the ignorant ones." - Michael Bakunin: "Marx, the Bismarck of Socialism" (1870).

"Our system; which allegedly represented a policy 'in the interests of the workers, in the interests of the people' was completely insensitive towards the working people as producers as well as consumers. The system which justified its centralised structure by the alleged requirements of scientific direction, did not provide scope for enterprise ..... Such a structure (Russian style marxist political economy) therefore requires a particular interest group which comes foreward in the name of the working class .....and which acquires certain nonsocialist traits." Radavor Richta (central committee of Czech communist party) "Models of Socialism" translated in Australian Left Review 1969 No. 1.

The current selfcriticism of communists and ex-communist socialists surely stands as the major justification of the anarchist reservations about the marxist state. (A later article will deal with social democracy).

On the role of a socialist party (and thus the roles of sections of the I.W.M.A.) the anarchists stood for propaganda and non-parliamentary organisation of the working class (and of the peasants). The marxists stood primarily for the organisation of political parties of the organised working class (that part of the class called the 'labor autocracy' by Bakunin). Partly this was because Marx believed that the successful completion of the bourgeois revolution required the power of the organised working class (Bakunin by 1870 did not support any bourgeois revolutions), and partly because in Germany and England, for different reasons, prior political capture of the state appeared a precondition for revolution (or at least a breakdown in capitalism could only be exploited if a party was already available to take power.) History endorsed neither view unanimously: Marx's favorites, the German socialist party and the English unionists had blundered into complete defeat as socialist bodies a little before the Bakuninist creation, the Spanish anarchist movement, was destroyed by the two twentieth century totalitarianisms.

PLAIN ANARCHISM, MARXIST ANARCHISM AND ANARCHIST MARXISM.

Part 2. Anarchism and Social Democracy 1871-1914 (1969)

For a while after the collapse of the First International - due to Marx's removal of the Central Council to New York where it quietly died - it seemed that anarchism in its Bakuninist form might take the labour movement in all bar the northern countries. The anarchists of the Swiss (Jura) federation of the old International sent the so-called Souvillier circular to all other surviving national sections and in 1872 these assembled at St. Imier to create a new organisation.

The "St. Imier" International - which lasted until 1877 - combined nearly all the groups that had opposed Marx's control of the Central Council; anarchists, trade unionists and state socialists. The conflict between the anti-political stance of the Bakuninists and the politics of the northern socialists proved too great a strain for the organisation which having produced a stream of compromise conference resolutions finally fell apart. In the end only the anarchists remained in the organisation and the socialists called their own United Socialist Conference. The anarchist delegates went on to this from their own conference and it split completely over the issues of state ownership and political activity. Neither the anarchists nor the socialists could sustain an international alone and so by the end of the 1870's the old international had completely disintegrated into its national and ideological components. In Spain and Italy the movement was predominantly anarchist: in France it was split; in Austria the social-democrats themselves were split into moderate and (quasi-anarchist) radical factions. The English movement was splitting and mainly interested in trade union affairs. In Germany, the movement, marxist in phraseology, was social-reformist in fact.

When the socialists initiated the series of conferences known as the Second International the anarchists unsuccessfully applied for membership. The majority of

the first conference voted to exclude them and so the split between anarchism and social-democracy was finally formally established. Anarchists were set the task of establishing a counter-organisation and counter-theory to the social democrats.

From time to time the anarchist movement called its own conferences but these rarely set up organisations of any duration. The general nature of anarchist doctrine and activity - propaganda and insurrection - tended to make anarchist organisations small and/or short-lived. Thus it proved impossible to form a durable anarchist international. Similarly national organisations tended to be loose federations of groups: there was no national activity to engage in and so no necessity for strong national bodies. Obviously even quite large anarchist movements, e.g. that of Spain with about 50,000 members, could not do anything except in a national revolutionary emergency.

The solution to this political impotence of anarchism - to some extent a revision of anarchism - was found in France.

After the collapse of the attempts to form an anarchist International the French movement became a network of small groups held together by constant contact between militants (activity rather than membership card being the basis of membership) and a few national anarchist papers. The movement did not attempt any constructive ventures but engaged in ceaseless agitation and organisation of marginal groups such as the Paris unemployed. Simultaneously there was a general rise in the influence of anarchist ideas in French literary and artistic life. As a result when individual terrorism began in the 1890's the numerically small anarchist movement had considerable respect from both workers and intellectuals. After a period of assassinations, bombings and robberies initiated by Ravochol the government staged show trials of leading anarchist militants and intellectuals. The tactic failed because the public called for acquital but the anarchist movement had had a salutary shock and sought avenues for constructive work.

The activities attempted in the aftermath of the terrorist period included the creation of anarchist communes in the countryside - some of which lasted in the 1930's, the creation of anarchist schools and "Universities Populaire" (adult education) and revolutionary work in labour organisations. Of these the latter was destined to be the most significant.

The French Labour movement, crushed by the defeat of the Paris Commune, had been reviving in the 1880's and 1890's and insofar as it was organised was predominantly under the control of Guesde'sMarxists (reformists). This control was being challenged in the unions by anarchist proponents of the general strike, Allemandists (revolutionary socialists) and Blanquists. An important factor in the ultimate victory of the revolutionaries was the anarchist control under Pelloutier of the "Bourses de Travail" - labour exchanges originally set up by the reformists as a counter to the employers' "Bureaux de Placement". In 1894 a joint conference of the Federation des Bourses de Travail and the Federation Nationale du Syndicats declared for the revolutionary general strike and formed a committee for propagating the idea. In 1902 the organisations united under a predominantly revolutionary leadership.

The victory of the revolutionaries (and in particular that of the anarchists) was due to the faction fights for control of unions occasioned by the divisions between the socialist groups. The organised French worker wanted a strong and independent union and also had a distrust of bourgeois parliamentarians born of the betrayals of the past (and present and future). The solution of keeping "politics" out of the unions seemed natural.

Similarly the idea of an independent workers' organisation facing the hostile bourgeois state made sense in the light of the experience of strikes, lockouts, etc, the brutal crushing of the Paris Commune and the ideas put forward by the First International. Those anarchists not totally opposed to large organisations fitted in well in the new union movement and energetically set about building the syndicats and bourses, opposing the political parties and labour reformists in the unions and developing the syndicalist approach to revolution.

The existence of a powerful practical anarchist organisation having a theory of revolutionary struggle and of the organisation of post-revolutionary society - viz. that the syndicats and bourses were respectively the national/economic and local/

civil/cultural organs of the new society - constituted an implicit critique of social democratic aims and methods since the latter lacked either. However the syndicalists themselves did not work this out and the job was left to syndicalist influenced intellectuals many of whom were after 1920 to be found in the new communist parties along with the ex-syndicalists and the syndicalist-influenced left-wing of the old socialist parties. The reason for this was that although anarcho-syndicalism was the only proletarian revolutionary doctrine before 1914 (since social democracy only had a theory of reformist and parliamentary action) the key concept of the general strike was a defensive rather than an aggressive one. Because of this incongruity of aim and strategy - the general strike being conceived as an alternative to violent insurrection - sympathetic intellectuals such as Georges Sorel were able to interpret it as a revolutionary myth. After the Russian Revolution syndicalism only lived on where it inherited the old insurrectional traditions.

STYLES (1969)

The cultural history of Australian youth for the past few years has been a succession of (only rarely-resisted) artificially promoted styles in dress, music, cars, drinks, and in fact anything else people can be persuaded to buy. The dialectic of tight pants/flared pants, mini skirt/maxi skirt etc., continues without sign of a final synthesis. It is alleged by some that this, highly profitable, cyclic movement is completely external to the person and is only a function of capitalist manipulation. If this is so (and believed to be so), then those youths suspicious of capitalism should show signs of stylistic stability.

But no. Instead we find the most ardent pursuit of cultural styles: the selfdefined left nowadays defines itself emotionally and culturally instead of intellectually and ideologically. Added to this enthusiastic acceptance of the market we find that "leftism" itself has no unity: it is a succession of styles which are so strongly adopted that most individuals leave the left when the styles go out. We have had the extended Victorian age of leftism - the drab anti-style of stalinism. Today, liberated from orthodoxy, the left rushes, almost en masse, from one position (style) to another within a year. It happens so fast that last year's styles from overseas may arrive simultaneously and contradict one another, e.g. the May revolt in France and the works of Marcuse struck the left's imagination almost simultaneously leading to the inevitable question: "does France refute Marcuse or does Marcuse refute France?"

Consider the list:National Liberation; Cultural Revolution; Worker-Student Alliance; Urban Guerilla Warfare Participatory Democracy; etc., etc. An idea emerges somewhere from someone's or some peoples' concrete experience and gradually is refined and articulated for that specific situation. It is noticed by the Press, or is spread in left journals, and, suddenly uprooted from its context, it is transported with all its attendant slogans, methods and errors to a completely different situation. In its new home it is no longer subjected to the criticism it received when it was a relevant idea. It becomes an absolute - a style has arrived.

In the cultivation of the new style people go to ridiculous lengths. Movements are set up aping the overseas movement (which alone has content) in name and form. Copies of overseas posters are made or imported at a ridiculous expense, for hanging in kitchens, bedrooms and toilets. The overseas literature is extensively read - an error because nearly all leftist literature is written with an ideological pen; it distorts the actual situation and abstracts from the real origins of the idea or movement supposedly under study. Finally the vocabulary and interests of the overseas group is adopted, and the style crystallises.

Due to the relative backwardness of the Australian left, and to the difficulties of communication, the style at each university varies. Brisbane is basically defined by the worker-student alliance; Monash by the somewhat bastardised maoism of the Langer group; Melbourne and Sydney by the early sixties form of the American new left. There are, of course, other forms of leftism at these universities. Those who differ from the dominant style of a university will most likely form the core for the creation of the next style or will associate with other dissidents to form an Australian left, viz one not obviously related to any overseas group or situation.

Characteristics

Space does not permit a discussion of all styles so I will concentrate on the Melbourne group. The several characteristics of this group are:-

1. A (possibly excessive) concern with the morality of actions by politically responsible individuals or groups. A basic tenet (which I accept) is that an administrator is to be held responsible personally for any of his official actions. However, apart from quoting the Nuremberg judgements, nothing has been produced to support this belief, so it is seen to be held on emotional grounds. (Anarchists hold it as a practically justified position - see Stuart Christie's article in Treason 3/7/69.)

2. An analysis of all political events in terms of a we - they dichotomy, i.e. a concentration on the phenomena of power elites. There is a tendency to concentrate on the obvious point viz that elite groups hold nearly all social and political power, rather than the important point that the people have allowed this to happen. There has been no informed analysis of the problem of "voluntary servitude".

3. The use of specifically american terms of analysis. Possibly the best term here is "military-industrial complex". Quite often we are told that Australia is become a militarist society, and more occasionally that we have or are getting a "military - industrial complex". Are we?

The American system of defense procurement involves the letting of contracts for research and development, and manufacture to private industry. Very little is produced by government factories or developed in government laboratories. Also, firms develop unsolicited systems for sale to the government. Thus, continual government expenditure on defense is necessary for the defense industry to survive. In Australia the department of supply employs about 22,000 people for research and development, manufacture and inservice testing. Very little is contracted out to Australian companies e.g. Collins and Plessey. All large equipment is bought from overseas e.g. Mirage, F-III, Charles F. Admas class destroyers, etc. With this situation, Australia's defense industry probably will never be particularly profitable. And the defense expenditure is too low to be tied to the American system and yield the superprofits desired. It is unlikely that Australia will ever have continuous defense expenditure as in the American system.

A start has been made on the task of analysing the Australian reality. Until some headway is made, overseas experience may be assumed irrelevant.

TO SECONDARY STUDENTS (1970)

When you were five years old (or was it four) you were sent off to school, and with about thirty or forty other children of your own age herded into a classroom, in which you were to spend the next year. This was repeated next year, and for another four years.

At the end of six years you have completed your primary schooling, that is, you have been instructed, brainwashed, disciplined and punished and taught subjects which you may or may not have liked but were unable to do anything about.

Then the process is repeated for another six years (if you can last that long), but in secondary school it is at a much more formal level. You spend X forty minutes studying mathematics, Y forty minutes studying english, Z forty minutes studying history and so on whether you like it or not. Usually there is little choice of subjects below fifth year. It does not matter anyway because you have no say in what you learn (and probably your teachers are restricted by centralized planning of courses), so you either conform or face the consequences, e.g. fail exams, have a nervous breakdown.

In fact your schooling is basically to teach you to become good, loyal citizens; to conform but never to question the structure of society as it is. The methods range from making you wear school uniforms, compelling you to study certain subjects to rigid enforcement of disciplinary rules. So if you want to be different you had better watch out.

So in saying this the LIBERTARIAN EDUCATION COMMITTEE believes that any connection between education and schooling is coincidental. Educating should be based on the free enquiry and spontaneous activity of all students with the co-operation of all teachers.

Some suggestions:-

1. Meetings of students and students directly concerned in making decisions involving curricula, timetables, etc. a school council consisting of students and teachers may be helpful in running the general affairs of the school, and resolving problems.

2. Increasing the scope of studies available e.g. languages and culture, mythology, and such subjects along with art, drama, music, to be placed on an equal footing with mathematics, english, etc.

3. Free choice of subjects to be made by each student so he/she will not have to study subjects that he/she feels may be irrelevant, unnecessary, or uninteresting; thus the abolition of compulsion to study any particular subject. From this it follows that each student will study subjects that he/she finds interesting and useful.

4. Abolition of compulsory attendance. Each student will attend when he/she wants to. Thus schools will open for longer periods during the day and at night when parents and others may attend, to further their own culture and share experiences. Schools could become social, educational and cultural centres.

5. Removal of authority, punishment and "school rules."

6. Abolition of school uniforms. They tend to destroy individuality. The argument that it covers up social and economic differences is a sham. If these differences exist, why hide them?

7. Dissolution of the prefect system and all such systems because they create an elite; a class system amongst the students with its accompanying bullying and vindictiveness.

8. Abolition of examinations and other such "test methods" which lead to cramming, mental stress and competition between students.

ON WORKERS CONTROL 2 (1970)

Again we hear the cry for Workers Control; the first time for perhaps thirty years. And this time demands for Workers Control seem to be coming more from students than from workers. And workers who call for it do not do so through their Trade Unions but rather through unofficial groups which exist outside the official Trade Union organisation. Trade Unions, of course, do not exist to promote an end to capitalism. They could not exist in their present form outside a capitalist society (or state capitalist or "socialist" society, e.g. the USSR). Trade unions exist to defend the interests of their members - e.g. wages, working hours and conditions - and the jobs of their leaders. A group of workers trying to increase their participation in decisionmaking in their factory through channels other than traditional trade union ones may find that their worst enemy is their trade union boss. These remarks are general but probably apply to almost all countries.

Is society ran by workers instead of managerial elites possible today in any country? It is necessary to look outside Australia since with the exception of the Industrial Workers of the World - strongest before and during WW 1 - this country has no tradition of movements standing for workers management. In both France and Britain

however there are examples of enterprises controlled at the factory level entirely by the workers themselves.

A short history of the various movements. The first appeared in England in 1914-15, then Russia in 1917 followed again by Italy in 1919-20. At the end of the First World War there were the Spartacists and Revolutionary Shop Stewards in Germany and similar movements in Austria and Hungary but these were quickly crushed or recouperated by state power.

Next came the most important example: the Spanish Revolution. In the province of Catalonia peasants seized the land, workers took over production in the factories and regional committees handled problems of supply etc. For some fifty years previously the people had been educated in the ideas of workers control and social ownership by the anarcho-syndicalist trades union, the CNT, and by its predecessors. In the middle of 1936 the CNT was strong and the Catalan government weak. But the workers did not destroy the government completely and in 1937 it destroyed the revolution in Catalonia.

Other limited movements have occurred in Yugoslavia 1950, Hungary 1956, Algeria 1962. There have also been the ejidos Cagricultural communes) in Mexico at their peak in 1936 but now run more or less privately. Also the Kibbutzim in Israel but these have subjected themselves to the government.

Some conclusions may be drawn from these examples: when capitalist institutions cease to take responsibility for production the proletariat eontinue running industry spontaneously without prior exposure to propaganda. And in Catalonia the people, because of their prior education, were able to take over a whole region and stage a revolution which would have succeeded if the external forces of destruction had not been so great. But in all cases the governments were able to strengthen their armed forces and crush the workers. If the governments had been completely crushed while weak the control of industry and agriculture by the workers and peasants may have been achieved in many of the above examples; particularly Germany, Russia and Spain.

NOTES ON MILITANT ACTION (1970)

1. Increasingly the distinction between industrial and white collar workers is becoming unimportant in the consideration of potential militancy; more relevant variables would appear to be the size of the enterprise and the rates of pay.

2. Militant action is compatible with the maintenance of the status quo. Politically motivated militancy is hard to maintain as money runs out and often depends on a certain cultural-occupational basis e.g. seamen, wharfies, miners. It is hard to escalate ordinary strikes into a full confrontation with state power. Australian unionists, including revolutionaries, will rarely attack property directly by sit-ins (real ones not student ones), "seizure" of factories (production during a sit-in) or running services, e.g. busses, free.

3. It must be remembered the general strike over Clarrie O'Shea was a reaction to an invasion of union rights in a campaign to extend them and so was strictly analogous to the support a Monash maoist receives when he is about to be expelled. It did not imply that O'Shea had any control over the movement. Politicised workers know this; students find it hard to learn.

4. The 'narodnik' strategy of taking issues to the people, ie. of doing propaganda on a geographic-residential basis, has the intention of helping local residents feel that they are somehow taking part in a struggle. However, it does not seem to be particularly fruitful since 'the people' are separated from the shop floor where most struggles take place; workers in a given area are not necessarily resident in that area and there do not seem to be many directly local issues. If the target area was geographically isolated, it may be possible to develop integrated struggles and the emergence of a left leadership but not if it is only part of suburbia.

5. On suburbia. It is very hard to approach suburbanites; the chief function of suburbia seems to be to instil pettybourgeous ideology. Most workers live in suburbia.

6. The maoists are reformists of the worst type; populists. They will talk about the high price of land, wages and (perhaps) union rights - e.g. their support for the teachers - but this is just a petty-bourgeois anti-capitalism. This sort of thing has been tried in the U.S. and failed. The maoists will fail because they have no analytical powers, only invective.

7. Where the maoists fail is that they don't suggest strategies that bring people into direct conflict with the forces affecting their lives. Because of their simplified and un-marxist model of class rule, the maoists believe that everyone should be in the streets fighting police and voicing vague and abstract demands - i.e. chanting slogans - such as "Down with capitalism" or more strictly "Down with U.S. Imperialism" - sometimes one fears that they wish an alliance with our 'national bourgeoisie' (sic). Thus those tactics which would bring conscious conflict into everyday life and so advance revolutionary education are neglected in favour of pseudo-militancy.

8, Related to this is their idea that transitional programmes are counter-revolutionary. The idea is that bigger and better fights with police, and bigger and better strikes in which union leaders are jailed, will automatically lead to a revolution, The maoists forget that the government and capitalists are capable of many responses to a situation; to take an obvious example, De Gaulle's offer a general election completely defused a pre-revolutionary situation. The maoists are incapable of seeing the complex ways in which capitalist or neo-capitalist regimes hold power since they would prefer to hold naked power themselves. In reality only Stalin's Russia and more recently the East European states were or are ruled purely by the barrels of guns. Nothing else could save these from politicised but un-integrated working class. The idea of developing programmes to exploit particular aspects of the manner in which we are ruled is foreign to them. If in fact we were ruled by men with machine guns standing on every corner, there would be a point in a military approach. Since we are not ruled in this manner, there is the real question of how the ruling class ensures its dominance.

9. The popular answer at present is 'bourgeous hegemony', i.e. that the ruling class has its ideas accepted by the working class. Obviously this is partially true but it does not add much to our understanding, especially since the ideas of many left groups, e.g. the maoists, are not greatly different from bourgeois ideas or are closely related, e.g. the anti-sexual bias, the belief in the incapacity of workers without outside leadership, the work ethic, the belief that one should 'serve the people' (i.e. do a good deed each day for the ex-public school maoist boyscouts), the insistence on hierarchy and discipline and the opposition to self-determination and self-liberation. Since the ideas are so similar one would expect progress in maoising those most imbued with bourgeois ideology. This is in fact the case; proportionately students must provide more maoists than any other social group. However, the success cannot be repeated with other bourgeois groups, e.g. the farmers, since they have interests in the status quo.

10. This brings us to the crunch. Despite predictions of the immiseration of the proleteriat both the wage and satisfaction levels have been steadily rising, nor does it matter that profits are also rising (except insofar as this contradicts a marxist law). Like everyone else, the workers have some stake in existing society. Thus the maoist idea of some sort of civil war has no atrraction and neither does socialism as an abstract alternative to present society. No-one is happy with the government but it is generally believed that changes can be made. "Political" socialism of either the revolutionary or reformist varieties cannot get around this because it still postulates workers and work; it can hardly offer tremendous improvements in the workers' material conditions and it still postulates external management, albeit by a governmental rather a capitalist bureaucracy. Adding to this the general expectation that revolution involves generalised destruction, one can see why the workers are not keen to start the revolution. More importantly perhaps, the proletariat has an organisational stake in the status quo; its parties and unions have official

recognition, they get some things done and they drain off political and administrative talent that may have otherwise served revolutionary purposes. In this situation the greatest ally of purely political revolutionary groups is the dissatisfaction which arises from contradictions between the value systems produced by bourgeois society and the daily practice of capitalism.

Thus the greatest boon to the political left is the Vietnam War which is an accidental aspect of our society and not by any means a necessary one. (Despite the cant about imperialism it is not primarily an economic war; its cost outweights any possible benefit.)

11. The limitations of purely political groups suggest that a new approach is needed. My previous remarks foreshadow the idea that the strategy should be that of aggressive confrontation in everyday life.

MAY'S ANARCHIC DAYS (1970)

Question: Why do you work an eight hour day?

Answer: Because you don't work a fifteen hour day?

But is an eight hour day congenial? Do you feel it really doing you good?

It must be good: you have been doing it for seventy-five years ... real groovy...

IN THE BEGINNING (1886 A.D.) there was the McCormick Harvester Works, the strike, the scabs, the cops, the bodies of slain workers, the 'REVENGE' circular, Haymarket Square, the bomb, the four hanged anarchists, (the fifth blew his head off with dynamite), the International, the eight hour day movement, the May 1st demonstrations, the flags, the solidarity, and the laughter of children. What remains???

THE EIGHT HOUR DAY

.....and a Sunday perambulation.

(This year, May 3rd they tell us, Massive Manifestation of Working Class Solidarity?)

What were once the tasks of workers' movements are now the tasks of all. These are the destruction of hierachy and privilege, great and petty. The destruction of an industrial system, which, from the Urals to the Dandenongs, transforms the products of nature into the wastes of society, the free gifts of God into the false gods of MAN. All that we produce becomes garbage (?). Why make eight hours of garbage a day? It would be easier to dispose of two hours worth. The classical economists proclaimed the concept of socially useful work. We have discovered socially useless work. It is what most of us do.

DON'T RUBBISH AUSTRALIA

Send it to your local member.

Produced by: A. Gestetner, C/- P.O. Box 192 Carlton South, Victoria.

PRE-MORATORIUM LEAFLET (1970)

The basis of a revolution must be cultural as well as being political and social. Therefore, we urge all dropouts, alcoholics, lunatics, junkies, bludgers, neorotics, prisoners, inmates, schizophrenics, the unemployed, the insane, the psychologically unsound, the freaks, the lazy, and other assorted maniacs to come out on the streets on May the 8th and join the revolution, Nay, make the revolution.

The revolution will not come from orderly street marches, peace police (or marshalls with M's on their hats), grey suited businessmen who spend the rest of the week exploiting people, ALP politicians who are frustrated at not being able to exploit

people, authoritarian students, leaders of any description or respectability. Have a look at the leaders. See how serious they are; their intense faces looking down upon their congregations, frowning upon any spontaneity of their flocks,upon any action not in the script, upon any gaiety. We must all be solemn and look how solemn the followers are. Wisely following their informed, authoritative and noble leaders. Such is the stuff of revolutionaries? What bloody tripe.

Revolutionaries aren't interested in all that stuff. The dropouts, the uninhibited in our society provide us with a revolutionary culture. They refuse to take part in a repressive, authoritarian society, and many are persecuted for their beliefs and actions. Parents and bosses try to repress us while we are still young. In kindergardens and child-minding centres, children are brainwashed into accepting our lovely way of life. THERE CAN BE NO REVOLUTION until four year olds throw away their teddy-bears and blankets and come out on the streets. And it must be many children. The wayward, whether child, teenager or adult may end up being psychoanalysed. Luckily not enough psychoanalysts for us all - yet.

Are there any children left who want to be free? To reject all the garbage of our society, education, politics, consumerism - most adults spend their lives producing material and mental garbage which is generally useless, but highly necessary for their commodity - inflated egos. They work their guts out, producing per day, eight hours of wastage. Revolution demands the annihilation of consumer culture. The rejection of work - enjoyable activity Yes, Work No. Why slave ?

What has all of this got to do with the Moratorium. The Moratorium is another consumer fetish, direct from the USA. It gives participants a valid reason for taking the day off, for marching, for showing their real concern about the Vietnam War. But does this help the Vietnamese, Laotions and Cambodians under the repression of the USA-SAIGON, HANOI-NLF, CAMBODIAN, LAOTAN ROYALIST and PATHET LAO WAR MACHINES. Maybe, but wouldn't it be better to create a revolutionary situation in Australia, in the streets of Melbourne. And in the suburbs, from Werribee to East Hawthorn, Coburg to Cheltenham, Kick industry and commerce out of the streets. Refuse to produce and transport rubbish. Ignore the legal signs and directions, the petty restrictions which penetrate our lives . We live in the cities, so let's make the cities live. Set an example to the rest of the world. Show them the uselessness of work, leadership - authority, governments and their lackeys. Join the lunatics, drug-addicts and wild-eyed freaks on the streets. Be yourself.

The Lunatic Fringe

THE GROWTH OF THE AUSTRALIAN ANARCHIST MOVEMENT (1970)

Anarchism, even when seriously considered, can mean different things to different people. According to their understanding of the term the existence of anarchists in 1970 Australia will seem to be a manifestation of external human nature, a romantic reaction to our "respectable or bourgeois" society, an anachronism or just a sheer absurdity. Thus before giving the history of the movement in modern Australia it may be valuable to briefly describe several ways of looking at anarchism.

Some historians of anarchism see it as an idea present or potentially present in all civilized societies. This idea, philosophic anarchism, is that men are fundamentally equal (and probably fundamentally good) and that the government of one man by another, i.e. the subjection of one man by another, is degrading for both.

Parallel to this, some anarchists see anarchism as a movement of social protest animated by the ideal of "philosophic" anarchism instanced throughout recorded history.

Conversely, historians of political thought have seen anarchism as a body of theory developed during the nineteenth century and early twentieth century by a small number of social theorists which has influenced various political, social and artistic movements.

Most anarchists would have taken the parallel position to this; viz. that anarchism is the revolutionary movement which developed out of the bakunist wing of the First International (IWMA) under the influence of the ideas of Bakunin himself and later Kropotkin.

Today, however, there is a revolutionary syndicalist interpretation of anarchism which will probably become a dominant view within the far left once the current "Third World" fad runs out. This tendency relates itself to the revolutionary proletarian movement of the last century, i.e. from the Paris commune of 1870 through the Russian revolutions of 1905, and 1917-20, the Spanish revolution of 1936-7 and the French revolution of 1968. For this view anarchism, or at least the valid part of anarchism, is anarcho-syndicalism, whether so-called or called revolutionary marxism.

As will be clear from the following discussion, Australian Anarchism is best considered as a union of philosophical anarchism and revolutionary syndicalism of the type above. Although the classical anarchist theorists are still read, and read by an increasing number of people, they are only one current of thought contributing to modern anarchism; despite the formal representation of Australia at the 1968 international conference at Carrarra, Australian anarchism is not linked closely to the historical anarchist movement.

There have been anarchist groups and individuals in Australia since the late nineteenth century. By and large, these had disappeared by the Depression. After the second world war immigrant anarchists formed their own foreign language groups and there were also English-speaking groups around during the 40's and 50's. Today's anarchist movement developed chiefly from the Sydney Anarchist Group.

In Sydney during the 50's there was a certain community between the non-C.P.A. left (anarchists, trotskyists, etc.) and the Sydney libertarians - a rather dated group of free thinkers ultimately deriving from, and reacting against, the philosophy of Prof. Anderson of Sydney University. This community of the left and ultra-liberal was sufficiently large to form a barrier against the relatively hostile environment.

Although the S.A.G., which was chiefly composed of migrants, never managed to take root in the community at large it never completely disintegrated either. At various times in the 50's and 60's it apparently collapsed and was then revived; during periods of collapse anarchism continued as individuals at libertarian meetings.

The S.A.G. attempted several publishing ventures: the "Anarchist Review" (duplicated, 3 issues), "Red and Black" (printed, 3 issues) and "The Anarchist" (duplicated 4 (?) issues). At the same time the Libertarians produced "Broadsheet" (monthly), and "The Sydney Line" (compilation of Broadsheet articles) and "Libertarian" (occasionally). There was considerable cross-fertilisation between the two groups - the chief contribution of the Libertarians being their trenchant criticisms of classical anarchism. Although Sydney anarchism never developed a distinctive position - unless libertarianism is anarchism - it is probably moving, along with various trotskyist groups towards the sort of position exemplified by Cohn-Bendit with various alterations according to individual political backgrounds. The classical anarchist immigrant groups have ceased to be significant.

In the mid 60's an anarchist group developed in Brisbane. This group was responsible for the first radical anti-conscription and anti-war demonstrations in Brisbane. Later, its university wing helped in founding the Campaign Against Conscription and S.D.A. Its members established contact with "Red and Black" and later its dispersed members joined groups in Melbourne and Sydney. Also in 1966 a short-lived libertarian group started at Monash and the group T.R.E.A.S.O.N., in direct contact with Sydney and Brisbane, started at Melbourne.

T.R.E.A.S.O.N. (The Revolutionary Emancipists Against State Oppression and Nationalism) which overlapped with the Melbourne University A.B.S.C.H.O.L. and anti-war groups, later developed into the Melbourne Anarchist Group. It defined itself as "open to anarchists, pacifists, and libertarians" and published a list of heroes ranging from Jesus Christ to Emiliano Zapata. Although it did not promulgate any

line, T.R.E.A.S.O.N. held implicitly to the following theses:

(1) Anarchists should be active in all other social and political action groups.

(2) The classical theorists were anarchists, but anarchism is not the classical theory.

(3) Anarchism is not utopian - there is no final state of society - but contrary to Sydney libertarianism, anarchist revolution is possible and desirable. Various different organisations of anarchist society are possible but the fundamental guarantee of free society is the willingness of individuals to continue to assert their freedom. Thus permanent anarchist revolution may be necessary. This position is related to that of Virgilia D'Andrea in her article "The vanquished who do not die". The article is reprinted every year.

(4) Knowledge of classical anarchist theory is useful; knowledge of anarchist - and socialist - history is essential.

(5) Revolution is not just conquest of political power but is the change of social institutions and the change of mental horizons which accompanies the revolutionary change. As Gustav Landauer said: "The state is a form of relations between individuals - we do away with it by learning to live without it."

(6) Humour, of a surrealistic, bohemian or romantic strain, is the most valuable weapon in the struggle to re-educate the university.

(7) The anarchist revolution is basically "Syndicalist" i.e. it must be carried out by the seizure and restructuring of social organisations from within. (e.g. the I.W.W.: by organising industrially we are building the new society within the shell of the old). However, this day is far off; it depends on the development of a broad revolutionary movement of a syndicalist and democratic tendency.

(8) In the existing situation all that is possible is possible is subversion of official society; the establishment of parallel and counter-institutions both inside and outside the official ones.

(9) It is never worthwhile answering silly questions (or examining pseudo-problems).

In all this T.R.E.A.S.O.N. was close to the overseas developments of situationism (France), Provoism (Holland) and neo-Wobblyism (U.S.A. and U.K.) It is interesting to note that these developments were independent and were all products of the sixties.

In 1969 Sydney Libertarianism started to take an anarchist turn and both it and anarchism (dormant since 1968 and the Dwyer LSD takeover) started to revive. Also, after the 1968 events in France and Czechoslavakia, the non-anarchist left began a movement towards marxist syndicalism. While new anarchist groups appeared in Brisbane and Adelaide, various trotskyist and SDS/SDA type groups started carrying red and black flags and talking of anarcho-marxism. The C.P.A. started talking of worker control. In Melbourne anarchism spread beyond the University and links to rank and file unionists began to develop.

In 1970 a successful conference was held in Sydney, and in Melbourne the movement became a communicating network of four groups: Melbourne and La Trobe university Groups, "Solidarity" magazine and a purely worker group. Independent demonstrations were organised. At May Day demonstrations, migrant groups joined the new youth groups.

The general programme of Australian anarchism seems to be:

1. Join in the general anti-war and anti-conscription movement. Preparatory to its eventual collapse, to take the initiative in forming coalitions

about such issues as pollution, "slum-reclamation", aboriginal rights and other issues. (The Melbourne anarchists were one of the first groups to join the Vere Street, Richmond, residents in their fight with the Housing Commission . They have commenced a general investigation of the Commission and inner suburban re-development).

2. Engage in "dialogue" with the traditional left around such concepts as "worker control", "self-activity" and "proletarian dictatorship."

3. Within the universities work to form an alliance of traditional academics, radical liberals, and the left against the technological-managerial conception of the university, the extension of direct government control of higher education, and the trivialisation of intellectual disciplines.

4. Work from below, through high school groups, and from above through teachers' colleges, to create freedom and intellectual opportunity in secondary schools.

5. Wherever one is, "situate" oneself against repression and ignorance. Develop, by exemplification, anti-authoritarian attitudes and social relations amongst your fellow students or workers.

In order to implement this programme, it is necessary to reject all forms of sectarianism: both of emphasising theoretical divisions within anarchism and with other libertarian currents. (Sectarianism is simply the terminal stage of ideological brain disease.) Anarchist purism, like Marxist purism, is a rationalisation of impotence. There is no need for a one-one correspondence between theoretical currents and political action groups.

The business of anarchists is revolution, not theology. If more of the Australian left adopted this attitude we would be much further on.

DOCUMENTS OF THE "SAVE THE LEMMINGS" CAMPAIGN (1970)

(It is not completely clear where the idea of a march in support of the Lemmings came from - although one might suspect that the example of the American yippies had something to do with it - but it seems to have arisen on the fringes of the Melbourne Anarchists and then have been taken up at both Melbourne and La Trobe Universities. The anarchist orientation is fairly clear in the way the whole affair was turned into a parody of student maoist anti-imperialism but it is also important to note that the Lemming march suggested a general strategy for approaching the younger members of the youth culture. This approach - of movement into and exploitation of myth, fantasy and fairy tale - was tried out in the weeklong experiment of Fey Week activities at Melbourne and La Trobe Universities. It was a relative failure however because the intellectual foundations of the linkage of fantasy or myth and revolution were not worked out until some years later).

A. The Thoroughly Worthwhile Cause of Lemming Aid

On Saturday 25th there shall be a march to the Swedish Consulate starting from Toorak Village at 10.00 a.m. This "Save the Lemmings" march is organised by the Goon Club at Melbourne and deserves the support of absolutely everyone. Below we reproduce songs for the occasion, unearthed after much labour by our comrade and folklorist from the Melbourne Anarchists, Anne Sydenham.

Hymn for Lemming Aid

(Sung to the grand old tune of "The Red Flag")

1. The lemmings' fate it haunts us yet,
   In these dark days could we forget
   That they in deep despair do bide
   And drown their hopes in suicide.

2. Upon the tundra long ago,
A lemming tree stood in the snow
Where every five years at its roots
The lemmings held their lemming moots.

3. But oh to tell the saga sad
The tree was felled by men so bad
And every lemming far and near
Drowned itself in grief and fear.

Chorus (after each verse)

We raise our lemming banner high
Without our help they still may die
Though men may rant and men may rave
Perforce their fate we still may waive.

To finish the dirge rightly it is customary to chant the haunting refrain known long ago in the book of lemming folklore as "The Lay of the Last Lemming" which they all sing as they fling themselves into the cold north sea.

It is passed down to us, corrupted by the years as "Lemon Tree".

Lemming tree very pretty
And the lemming flower is sweet
But alas for the poor lemmings
No longer can they meet.

Finis

B. Raise High The Banner Of Marxist-Lemmingist Thought

Lemmings of the World UNITE !!

DARE TO STRUGGLE DARE TO SWIM !!

Lemmings of Sweden, do not be crushed by the weight of Swedish aggressive imperialist exploitation. Lemming did not die in vain. - He died in Lemmingrad. Though the leaders of the oppressed Lemming proleteriatare lackeys and lapdogs of the government who lead you to a suicidal end in the icy waters of the Artic Sea, there is hope for you yet in the freedom-loving fraternity of Marxist-Lemmingist thought.

Though you may think that the filthy - comprador - imperialist aggressors the Swedish Government are your worst enemies, this is not so. For although they are the ones who profit from tourism by selling your mass fever of self-destruction to some decadent, debilitated, sadistic American bourgeois grandmothers on their trip of a lifetime who will actually pay money (exploited from American workers) to see your irresistable wave of self-slaughter, yes, even then they are not your true enemy ..... for they only exploit your deaths rather than pervert your revolutionary consciousness. The latter is by far the greater sin.

Although the broadsheet put out by bourgeois revisionist elements in the Lemming Action Committee professed to give some facts in its mealy-mouthed tirade.... "The Legend Of the Lemmings", what they did not say was where their information came from. They had gleaned their "facts"??? from that vile arch example of American cultural imperialism ---- "The Mickey Mouse Annual" of 1951. They will try to pervert you with their lies, they will try to mislead you from the path of true revolutionary thought but do not listen to their misguided rantings. Uphold the banner of true revolutionary Marxist-Lemmingist thought.

RAISE THE CLENCHED PAW OF LEMMING LIBERATION

SMASH SWEDISH IMPERIALISTIC EXPLOITATION !!

MARCH MARCH MARCH

Authorised by: V. I. LEMMING for the PEOPLES LEMMING ARMY.

C. Marxist-Lemmingists on the Road to Power!

On Saturday 25th militant lemmingists of the Melbourne Goon Club fought their way from Toorak Village to the Swedish Consulate against a heavy stream of traffic.

Singing the revolutionary hymn to Lemming aid they battled the counter-revolutionary black band of revisionist wizard, Ian Channel.

The Australian rulingclass, long since convicted, before the bar of world opinion, of supporting Swedish anti-lemming policies, compounded its guilt by sending its hired minions to 'protect' the consulate. They arrived too late.

Hearing of the presence of police, our comrades left a propaganda meeting they were conducting at Toorak Village. Re-inforced by recruits from the Village they hastened back to attack the enemy with balloons given to them by the villagers.

Having entered the consulate driveway the police were caught like rats in a trap- or like lemmings at a seashore. * Heavily outnumbered they were forced to surrender to the superior logic and justice of the Cause.

Many lessons can be learnt from this phase of the campaign. Firstly, it is not necessary to raise the troops to a high ideological level beforehand: they learn by struggle. Very few of those involved in the fighting were previously lemmingists. Secondly we must cease reliance on urban struggle and turn our attention to the suburbs where enemy concentrations are fewer and less strong. Thirdly propaganda activities, e.g. village meetings, must accompany all guerilla activity.

Southern Command.
Revolutionary Army.

* As is well known (e.g. see Lundberg 1948, Svein, 1950) lemmings do not just jump into the sea. They are driven into the sea by mercenaries hired by the Swedish ruling class.

The Lemmings waved their golden tails
And jumped into the Moat.
Though learned marxists search and scan
No single Neo-Stalinist can
Entirely see the joke.

D. A Participant Report

- Ho, Ho Lemming Power
- Marxist-Lemmingists of the World Unite.

The forty Lemming-lovers marched through the streets of Toorak in an effort to save the lemmings.

- Workers of Toorak! Come and join us. Was there a contradiction here? Very few people came and joined us. But they were confused and their reactions were various.

- So raise our lemming banner high....we sang in Toorak Village. Little children joined in the singing. Their parents smiled, looked nervous, read the handout, were amazed - and are probably still wondering. Two old ladies suggested in not very polite terms that we should do something useful like working, to the accompanyment of guitar and whistle. Saturday shopping was disrupted for a number of minutes as we strolled, sang, shouted, sat down and enjoyed our Saturday morning in Toorak Village.

Onwards to the Swedish Consulate. Back up Toorak Road to St. George Road. The march had started there along the middle of a Toorak Street into the oncoming trucks and cars which slowed to greet us. One Toorak woman made a special trip home to bring us several large balloons.

We were crossing Toorak Road with the lights and an old man in his shining new car tried to drive through us. At this stage we were joined by a one wizard opposition.

They're nothing but Reds! Oppose Marxist-Lemmingists! Support the Committee for Roos and Platypus-crap; the only genuine Australian movement .

As we neared the consulate for the second time, the police drove past and we noticed that our banners left there had been removed. The police were in the driveway. Storming the consulate was out. So we sat down in front of them and held a rally. Anyone was allowed to speak - even the opposition tendency.

After the rally a couple of girls attacked the police for having a dirty car and then proceeded to make use of it by scrawling "Save the Lemmings" on it with their fingers. One girl tied a red ribbon around the car. The police could do nothing - they were overwhelmed by the righteousness of our cause.

One demonstration in Toorak cannot save the lemmings of course. Afterwards at Jimmy Watson's the next stage of the long struggle was considered.

N.B. Some demonstrators ate lemmingtons.

EMPTY VICTORY (1970)

Some people are under the impression that the Wednesday march up Waterdale Road was a success. It was not. It was the collapse of the movement arising from the suppression of the Friday 11th demonstration. This does not matter particularly since many demonstrations will be suppressed in the future, but it does matter that some "marxists" have so mis-analysed the situation.

Last Wednesday's demonstration was no threat to the State: at any time they like to, the police and government may let you march down the street, equally they may decide not to. The situation arising out of the previous marches - the spreading of the knowledge that the government and police were quite happy to bludgeon boys and girls into the ground - could have been a threat. At least it would have added new recruits to the battle against the State. Wednesday's demonstration stuffed all that ;genial police and genial student "leaders" showing everyone that whatever had happened before was an isolated incident, a mistake, probably brought on by the students themselves.

It was entirely predictable that the government would order the police not to attack the march while it was proceeding as planned. The march was no threat and the police's publicity from the previous marches was adverse. The police were not intimidated; the State was not shaking. The 100 police were there to smash any breakaway march.

Some of the Head Marshalls had seen the police. The police knew the route and they knew that some of those marching would be apolitical students and staff i.e. precisely those people who should not have been allowed to see the Wednesday 16th beatings. Any deviation from the route or trouble with the march would be, by definition, due to "extremists" from Monash or the Wharfes, i.e. those people who may be beaten-up. The Head Marshalls undoubtedly assured the police of their tacit support if any action against breakaway groups was "required".

The State is not so much interested in smashing demonstrations as in smashing demonstrators. It wants to put out of action, by harassment, beatings, fines or jail, those who could implement a viable left-wing strategy when such is developed. Hence the violence on the 11th and the 16th. The State does not mind sheep; it is after what it imagines will become wolves.

POLICE, STATE AND STUDENTS (1970)

There was nothing unusual about police behaviour on the 11th and the 16th; what was unusual was that students were the recipients. The police usually make a clear

distinction between the middle class and what Graham Greene in "Our Man in Havana" calls the "torturable class". Only rarely, and then only to selected individuals, do police deal out the treatment to members of the bourgeoisie.

The actual meaning of the call for an inquiry and the march from Northlands on Wednesday is that police should recognise the student's claim to be bourgeois, either in fact or in embryo. The cry "No Cops on Campus" is simply the bourgeois demand that the police leave the middle class alone and oppress the working class alone.

It is unfortunate that this has been allowed to happen since it means that a new generation will come and pass through University without learning what the police are about.

In general only police in the Vice, Drug or Breaking Squads make much money. The policeman on the beat is underpaid. What then attracts him to the job? The answer is that the policeman is compensating for his lack of control over his own life - a condition arising jointly from his class background, low intelligence and rejection of a proletarian counter-culture i.e. acceptance of bourgeois society's self-image. He compensates for this lack of control by acquiring power over other people; he acquires the right to interfere with other peoples' lives and the right to pursue sadistic modes of behaviour without punishment. The characteristics of a policeman then are the following; acceptance, more or less in toto, of ruling class ideology, usually sadistic or psychopathic tendencies and a tendency towards aggressive behaviour directed towards his class, which he partly rejects, this rejection arising from feelings of social inferiority.

Given these characteristics it is not necessary for the government to order the police to be violent. They will be so independently of the party in power. Police violence is an effect of the hierarchical structure of society; the same form of social organisation that callsthem into being determines their chief characteristic. Why should we expect anything different? But independently of whether police do perform a real function in keeping down crime, and legitimate doubts have been raised about this, they also are one of the major props of the system that created them. We must abolish police and the State together. As shown in Barcelona in 1937, the revolution must abolish the police force or the police force, in the hands of the new rulers, will abolish the revolution.

A PLEASANT SATURDAY MORNING....ON THE STREETS OF MELBOURNE (1970)

(A Report on a Typical Old-Style CPA-ALP Controlled Demonstration)

The annual July 4th Memorial Service was held on the streets of Melbourne last Saturday. It began as a procession from the U.S. Consulate into the city where the main part of the service was held outside the Pan Am Shrine.

As the flocks moved away from the Consulate, they chanted the first psalm of the service - Psalm 128.

SMASH U.S. Imperialism

Smash **U.S.** IMPERIALISM

S-M-A-S-H U.S. IMPERIALISM

Worshipers were joining the procession of a steady rate along St. Kilda Road. The procession was well protected from heathens by a strong guard of police. As the march neared the Shrine, there was a re-enactment of the "Peking Avenue Incident" which took place in China in 1947. Mounted and foot police, and worshipers surged across St. Kilda Road as white clouds of incense rose slowly from the ground. The confusion created gave the impression that this event was in fact a reality in itself.

Back in line the crowd was chanting reverently -

HO HO HO CHI MINH

over and over. This was followed by a hymn - Onward Peoples Army.

Onwards peoples army
Marching to Pan Am
U.S. IMPERIALISM
Is what we must slam.

We will raise much money
For St. Ho Chi Minh
To help his valiant struggle
And absolve us from our sins.

Following on came Psalm 27 -

One, Two, Three, Four
People's Army, Peoples War.

The chanting and singing were very moving. There were some more chants of Ho, Ho, Ho, Chi Minh and the procession reached Princes Bridge. The Lay preachers for the day delivered a moving sermon to the masses of people in the city as the procession moved slowly through the streets of Melbourne.

- Pan Am is a symbol of U.S. Imperialism. It flies U.S. servicement to Vietnam for full fare and flies them home half-fare when they're dead...

- We must oppose U.S. Imperialism...

- U.S. Imperialism is world-wide...

- U.S. Imperialism is the cause of the war in Vietnam, and oppresses people all over the world...

- There can be no peace on earth until U.S. Imperialism is smashed...

The procession arrived at Pan Am. The number of worshipers had increased from about 800 at the start to about 3000. The lessons were read by the Rev. Stanley Moore assisted by workers and students. The crowd stood in silence. The collection was then taken up and the people were assured that 50% of all proceeds would go the N.L.F. - a truly meaningful gesture. Then the flocks sat in Collins Street and a performing group acted out a morality play which was spiritually uplifting to those present.

Finally, at the invitation of the police, the procession moved up Collins Street. Psalm 25 was chanted -

On, Two, Three, Four
The NLF will win the war
Five, Six, Seven, Eight
The U.S. will capitulate
Ho, Ho, Ho, Hum.

Some two and one half hours after it had started, the service concluded at the Treasury Gardens.

TOWARDS AN ANARCHIST FESTIVAL OF ARTS: A CALL TO AN ANARCHIST CONFERENCE (1970)

The consideration of a revolutionary strategy for Australia must proceed by taking as its point of departure the failure of the self-styled Maoists (M-L's) to achieve any lasting success on the basis of their 'policy' of 'Anti-imperialism'. During this last year there have been many struggles but all of those initiated on grounds related to anti-imperialism have turned into civil liberties issues and have not helped in the development of a mass revolutionary movement although they may have won a few recruits for the ageing Hill Group.

It is often forgotten that the political function of the theory of Capitalist

Imperialism was to explain the supposed "purely Trade Union consciousness" of workers in advanced capitalist societies and thus that its political practice is based on the assumption of a decline in revolutionary consciousness within such societies. Because this decline is necessary it is not necessary to examine the established political practice which is either capturing Trade Union leadership from the "reformists" of the ALP or infiltrating the unions or shop committees with cadres following the orders of the Party leadership. Although there is usually some clarity on the question of what (strictly "who") is to be opposed there is rarely any idea of a forward policy. Communist trade union policy is quite clearly a matter of alternating purely political and purely trade union issues, in this it is the same as any reformist policy; where it differs is that it is even more defensive.

There has been a considerable rise in revolutionary activity since the theory was proposed. Apart from the Russian revolution there were the abortive German revolution and the Spanish civil war. Since World War 2 there have been a series of revolutionary disturbances running from the East German one of 1953 to the French one of 1968. Increasing prosperity has not necessarily led to passivity.

The thoroughly reactionary practice of Communist parties in the West for the past 40 or 50 years has been based on the theory; the various China-line factions scream that they haven't been anti-imperialist enough, but this amounts to nothing more than the demand that they show their emotions more publically. A public campaign against imperialism as such must boil down to a campaign against particular wars on moralistic grounds - this is a partial explanation of the attraction of the M-L's for children with a moralistic home background. In practice the campaign cannot rise above the level of revolutionary gestures. Revolutionary practice cannot begin at the level of foreign policy.

If there is to be a revolutionary movement with strong roots in the society, then it must take the concrete problems of that society as its point of departure. To say that there is no evil which cannot be laid at the door of U.S. Imperialism, or with Menzies to say that there is no evil that cannot be laid at the door of world communism, is to substitute rhetoric for strategy. What is needed is a revolutionary analysis of Australian capitalist society which will serve as a guide in situating particular concrete struggles both subjectively and objectively within the context of the general movement.

What should the Conference disucss? Some preliminary Theses

On the industrial front the revolution demands the international and absolute power of the workers' councils. All revolutionary industrial activity should be aimed to this end. Any group that attacks the idea of workers direct democracy as unnecessary under socialism and/or reformist under the current circumstances thereby reveals its reactionary nature. The only way to develop revolutionary consciousness is to take part in revolutionary struggles aimed at changing the conditions of one's everyday life. This requires that one must use partial demands in a revolutionary manner; the propagation of revolutionary excitement (the revolutionary "high") is essential for any meaningful change.

On the university front it is essential to engage in continual struggle with the forces supporting the academic hierarchy and the narrowly economic view of the role of the university. In this it must be remembered that the war in the University is a limited war; although it is dramatic to have mass expulsions or a closedown it is not all that useful. It is quite possible to move towards control of the university without precipitating outside intervention; in general the administration will wish to avoid outside intervention also and so it is better to have the possibility of closing the university rather than to do it.

On the cultural front we must take Orwell seriously: all the usual productions of art and literature are saturated with the ethos of this society. Starting with children we must produce a revolutionary art and literature.

REPORT OF THE ORIENTATION HANDBOOK EDITORS (1971)

The main thrust of the argument in the Handbook, and in the practice derived from it, is towards the notion that certain tendencies are manifesting themselves in the socio-politico-academic development of the University; that these tendencies are largely the unconscious results of actions derived from antiquated theories or day to day struggles based on vague ideas of student rights; and that a more conscious development of these tendencies is possible. What the Handbook (understandably) does not state is the theoretical grounds underlying our selection of these tendencies as the important ones.

The reason for our non-statement of the underlying theory is that, as yet, the theories illuminating modern society are almost totally unknown in Australia and that the concepts in terms of which the theories are developed are unintelligible except in the light of an advanced theoretical knowledge of the relevant works. The key concept of this work is that of the "spectacular commodity economy". To our knowledge the only work of this tendency ever available in Australia was the pamphlet "On Student Poverty" and this, while treating students in the context of a general approach to revolutionary youth culture, did not approach the problem of the spectacular university. The reason for this is simple; in 1966, when the pamphlet was written at Strasbourg, French universities had not entered the modern world. French universities at that time were so feudally constructed that the problems associated with modern forms of repression (or better, conflict management) could hardly be posed within the university context. In this respect Australian universities were much more modern than French ones - although French universities will probably rapidly overhaul us given the new methods introduced after 1968. (French student politics, especially the U.N.E.F., was firmly under communist control and hence integrated into the more modern outside society rather than into the university one.) The Strasbourg situationists declared war on the emerging spectacular university when they dissolved the University Psychiatric Service. (An extreme gesture perhaps, but a thousand times more relevant than a sit-in in a Careers and Appointments Office.) We are already so integrated into a spectacular sub-society here that it would be difficult to explain the point.

Orientation Week is an anachronistic survival in the age of the spectacle. It is perpetuated by inertia and vested interest. In the spectacular commodity economy orientation activities serve the purpose of privatising the student mind. The university experience is exhibited as spectacle to the new students; chunks of it, e.g. Film Society, left activism, S.R.C. presidency, are retailed to them as socio-cultural commodities. University activities are for the student's consumption, not the result of his or her free creation. University life is exhibited as [illegible] a stage designed by someone else. The Administration and S.R.C. will provide the bread and the Labour club the circuses (although we admit that the S.R.C. provides very little bread and threatens to become a circus). Given this it hardly matters that Orientation Week bears the same relation to university life that a Hollywood film does to real life.

Within the spectacular university the various actors engage in tournaments of shadow boxing. Who cares if the S.R.C., especially its executive, is the Administration's transmission belt to the students; the alternative of democracy simply intensifies the unreality of so-called student government. What matters is that all student politics is a play to distract the audience from the fire in the back of the hall. Student politics is a delusion until students have been replaced by workers in the field of knowledge. Within the play we see lead actors who have forgotten that the Vice-Chancellor wrote the script parrotting their melodramatic phrases with all the ineptness of sincerity, Ideology becomes the flesh of our flesh. The world itself walks upside down.

In conclusion we quote an exchange from the cartoon strip "The return of the Durruti Column":

Pancho: "What's your scene man?"
Cisco: "Reification".
Pancho: "I guess that means plenty of hard work with lots of big books on a big table?"
Cisco: "Nope man, mainly I drift, just drift."

(Presented to the S.R.C. 11/3/1971)

FIGHTING ON TWO FRONTS: AGAINST THE UNIVERSITY ADMINISTRATION. AGAINST THE STUDENT MAOISTS (1971)

The central question dominating university politics at La Trobe in 1971 was the Admissions statute - usually called the Exclusion Statute by its opponents. All this document laid down was the conditions of admission to the university one of which was that no student currently under suspension from another Australian university could enrol at La Trobe. In the early seventies with students suspended at most Australian universities over demonstrations (rather than for cheating at exams or ordinary student crimes) this was very political indeed.

Despite the critical opposition by anarchists and their allies within the Labour Club the dominant maoist tendency managed to drag the issue through a sequence of occupations which finally led to the expulsion of large numbers of students and several thousand dollars worth of fines. Simultaneously the anarchists had captured the majority on a staff-student committee set up by the academic board to consider the question and when the board tried to reject their committee's report used their part-editorship of the student newspaper to publish the academic board papers together with other material compromising to the board. As a result the anarchist policy was adopted but the trials of the occupiers went on. In 1972 three maoist students were jailed for continuing to come to university and as the resultant occupations gradually dwindled to nothing (and the old labour club declined into apathetic cynicism) the anarchists set up a staff group, The Committee of Ten, which brought out a newsletter the "Bullet" in opposition to the university administration's "Bulletin". The agitation through the "Bullet" and at staff meetings coupled with the return to normalcy at the university eventually secured the release of the imprisoned maoists (although not before an anarchist lecturer was attacked by a fascist professor).

ONE MISTAKE

On Thursday 12th, a small group of La Trobe students marched down Waterdale Road to the local police station to deliver a decision of a general meeting of students. The reader is excused for not having known this. The reason for ignorance is simply that the demonstration was not advertised beforehand but was sprung upon a general meeting called about the Collingburn murder. This would be fair enough if the demonstration was <u>really</u> spontaneous, but of course it was not. The small group which has taken it upon itself to organise all "spontaneous" activities at La Trobe had discussed it beforehand but wasn't prepared to take other people into its confidence. In its enthusiasm for organising yet another demonstration the group completely overlooked the question of <u>prior</u> organisation. Even a little reflection would have revealed that the Collingburn protest could have been linked up with the bashings in Waterdale Road last year and the obvious lack of any action taken to discipline the police. It might also have been worthwhile to raise the question of what the S.R.C. had done about it and to have pointed out the true value of the Vice Chancellor's "promise" to ask Bolte to "investigate" the bashings. It could have been made quite clear what the value of "investigations" is - whether by the police or by "independent" bodies like the S.R.C. - but this was not done and so the arrest of a couple of police for manslaughter will allow everyone to go back to sleep. For those who believe in the dialectical inter-connectedness of absolutely everything our so-called "marxist-leninists" seem greatly averse to making these connections apparent; in the rush to notch up another demonstration all strategic considerations are neglected.

..... BEFORE ANOTHER

About the same time as the Collingburn debacle was planned the "vanguard" decided that it would hold a walk-in on next Monday's Council meeting. Apparently this was to be a protest against Apartheid and Imperialism. (The Chancellor, Glenn, is on the board of ICI.) Over Easter a meeting was held by inner groups from the three universities to consider joint action against the new Admissions statutes and so the line was changed and the walk-in became a protest against the Admissions statute. The method was to be the traditional one - call a meeting on Monday, vote through a condemnation of the Statute, vote to deliver this on mass to the Council, hey presto! an occupation. The essential point in the process is that once having

voted for the condemnation you are (morally?) bound to support "action" against the policy and so, by a somewhat twisted logic, to vote for its delivery immediately. (The Collingburn meeting unaminously declared against the police and so, after a harangue by Barry York, had to unaminously "support" the delivery of the motion to the police. In fact fewer than a quarter of those present "voted with their feet". For an occupation called out of the blue the numbers would be even smaller.) It is now said that anyone who votes to oppose the Statute, but refuses to support action i.e. occupation, without proposing a different sort of action i.e. occupation, is "on the right" i.e. a Rodger-Monagle. (Thus we have reached the stage that any sort of analysis, educational or organisational work unrelated to a demonstration is counter-revolutionary.) Fortunately the opposition persuaded our would-be Lenins to advertise what they intended to do before the meeting.

THE TRIVIALISATION OF DEMONSTRATIONS

There is a distressting tendency to confuse demonstrations with real action. (Some "maoists" believe that the only forms of action are marching, or sitting-down!) The essence of a demonstration is that it is an act of symbolic opposition; demonstrations are rapidly becoming a symbol of phony opposition. In ascending order of importance the functions of a demonstration are educating the public, embarrassing the target bureaucrats and building a community of feeling amongst the demonstrators which can then be transformed into a common dedication to political goals. If the latter is not achieved then the community of feeling dwindles and the remainder becomes a sect. The symbolic action becomes phony opposition. The policy of permanent demonstration is an expression of the political poverty of a group that can only define itself by demonstration i.e. individuals who can only prove themselves by symbolic acts of opposition.

MOVING BEYOND SYMBOLIC OPPOSITION TO REAL ACTION

The "vanguard" admits that the Council is only symbolic i.e. that an occupation of the Council meeting is only symbolic, it shows our opposition to U.S. Imperialism etc. Yet they cannot admit this to students - after all the Statutes are repressive and we really do want to do something about them. The central contradiction of student maoism is that they believe that real changes are impossible without a revolution and yet they are mortally afraid of winning concrete victories in case the improvements we make lead to a decline of revolutionary consciousness. (This no-win attitude shows quite clearly that their spiritual home is in the left of the ALP.) Because they have a purely military concept of revolution (thus the La Trobe Rifle Club) they are incapable of understanding the dialectical inter-connection of local struggles and victories and the global struggle. (Being at best vulgar marxists they believe that reformism comes about because the movement wins victories within the old society; they fail to perceive the roots of revisionism in the very scientistic Engelsianism to which they adhere. The victory of the proletariat is inevitable and "correct" ideas come from social practice but somehow all these revisionists have incorrect ideas. Abstractly opposed to "bourgeois" ideas they refuse to support intellectual engagement with them. For them ideas are feelings or at best images, the connection with vulgar scientific materialism is obvious).

The battle against bourgeois ideology must be fought and won NOW. The specific contribution of the university to the revolution is the demolition of the intellectual basis of bourgeois culture. Despite chinese opinions to the contrary this does not mean the demolition of intelligence and the replacement of it by other peoples' thoughts. (Intellectuals are not changed into proletarians by being forced to do manual labour, they are turned into proletarians by the advance of the commodity economy. Either that or they become revolutionaries.) The battle against bourgeois ideology of necessity includes the battle against the hierarchies and separations based on this ideology. We must expect, even demand, concrete results from our struggles. Organisationally these will be expressed by the democratisation of the academic structure and the transformation of course content and structure. We must produce both critical intellectuals and conscious proletarians. Externally the main battles will be against the bureaucratic rationality of the Australian Universities Commission and, most importantly, the struggle for the transformation of the schools.

On the subject of the Admissions Statute we must avoid turning the struggle for a principle of wide application into a struggle to re-instate students expelled from La Trobe. The exigencies of a reinstatement campaign ensure that by the time that the particular campaign is won, if it is won, everyone is too tired to go on with the general campaign. Furthermore the fact that the Administration over-reacts always means that a lot of the support generated is on the grounds of the harshness of the sentences rather than over the initial principle. It is also possible that there are people who disagree with the excessive use of the occupation tactic but who could be persuaded to take a stand against the Statute that we are supposed to be opposing. If we are serious about wanting to repeal the statute then we should try to create a broad movement of staff and students rather than confusing the issue by joining to it an extraneous "support the expellees" campaign.

If we are serious then the campaign should be directed against the Academic Board and should be linked with demands for a broadening and democratisation of such structures. The bourgeois nature of the university comes from the fact that within the university the real power is held jointly by the leading bourgeois ideologists and the proponents of technocratic rationality. The business men on Council are largely irrelevant. The technocrat will bureaucratise the outer world and the ideologists the inner one. These are our real and immediate enemies.

Oppose sidetracking the revolution. Out of the Council chambers and into the classroom! Smash fuck-wit ideology!

B. WHAT IS TO BE DONE? TO WHOM? (1971)

As first term draws to a close several political tasks remain. Virtually nothing has been accomplished on the exclusions issue - anyone who thinks that a threat of an indefinite "occupation" made by forty students at a meeting of two hundred will scare the Council into changing its policy simply shows that they should not be here in the first place. The S.R.C. executive has done nothing on the issue - if anything it has risen to new heights of irresponsibility. Nothing was done about the April 30th Moratorium - apparently our great leaders were busy elsewhere.

EXCLUSIONS

The central political error of the campaign so far has been the belief that the threat of symbolic violence by a single faction of the Left will scare anyone let alone bodies backed by the weight of academic inertia and behind that State power. To predict that State power will necessarily be used against an occupation is to assume that the university power structure is as juvenile as the Labour Club. The fact that the vast majority of students and staff accept the power structure as legitimate and will not actively oppose it even when they disagree with its actions is sufficient to ensure that the "liberal" centre, if freed of the pressure from the Wolfsohn/Monagle style lunatic fringe, would be able to deal with any occupation without raising a mass movement against itself. Because of this initial error, and because of the way the group concerned reifies all its decisions into "principles", it has started to look as though their major aim all along has been to get an occupation quite independently of any tactical value it may have. As a result the crowds attending the meetings have grown smaller each time; the basis for a genuine, as distinct from pseudo, militant strategy in the future has been severely undercut.

Since the only public actions this group will make are purely symbolic, and since by the very nature of the university the power structure rests on manipulated consensus and "liberal" ideology, it is doubly damning that this group should have neglected all attempts to win over students and staff in a battle of ideas. Being vulgar mechanists who believe that the power of the Council (and Academic Board if they have heard of it) exists eternally - or at least until Chairman Mao changes the Statutes - they neglect the fact that the power of these bodies to enforce their decisions is rooted in a particular social practice and that the power relations between the legal university of Vice Chancellors, S.R.C. Presidents and Boards and the real university of students, staff and workers, i.e. of real people, could be quite different. The whole basis of our strategy is in creating a militantly radical and democratic real university. To do this struggle in the realm

of ideas is unavoidable, to merely make militant, and to the majority meaningless, speeches is pure capitulation.

The fact is that it is impossible to build a real mass movement of staff and students against the existing power structures unless we can show them that these structures are impervious to both reasoned argument and popular pressure through the "proper channels." To do this we must construct, and take seriously, reasoned argument; both to show that the conservative majority on the Council and Academic Board is impervious to reason and to create the basis for popular pressure in Departments, Schools and any Consultative Committees that exist. At the moment there is little that students can do other than putting pressure on academics; sufficient motions have been passed to make our position plain and we have put up an alternative Admissions Policy which is being used as a basis by staff working against the Board's decision. The S.R.C. counts for nothing in the campaign; before the anti-exclusionists resigned they passed numerous motions on the subject, since then the S.R.C. has been irrelevant to the campaign although the executive is pro the existing exclusion policy - or a stronger version.

C. WHAT IS TO BE UNDONE.

> Oh Dear! What can the matter be,
> 22 Councillors without a lavatory,
> They were there to ignore the studentry,
> And nobody could really care.

Failures make more attractive characters than the successful; their faux-pas and their shortfallings lend them distinction while all seccesses dress the same and get hot under their white collars and ties and R.S.L. badges when failures barricade them in boardrooms.

When the local yokels nutted and bolted the University Council in their council pad for three hours they failed in a way never before attempted, let alone dreamt of. Didn't they notice that, while all rushing to the double glass doors on either side of the North - exit to the Council Room, the door through the Glenn College Office was left practically undefended, but no escape plan was forged by our captains of industry. Of course, Council didn't want to escape, except for Dr. Law who suffers from claustrophobia and Galbally who just suffers. It would not have done for the Maoists to be successful either, for without the exclusions policy and without Glenn and Callinan on Council, there wouldn't be any symbols left to attack. (Critics may claim that David Brown is a symbol of a prick, but this is wrong, he is a prick).

If the facts be known the Maoists and Co., and Council and Co. are very much dependent on each other. If it weren't for the Maoists the students might start investigating the role of courses and degrees in creating an "aristocracy of labour"; the Maoists, who revere Council (as a symbol -) like an icon, keep people diverted by attacking Council only, and for that our Captains of industry ought to be eternally grateful.

To misquote Mao Tse Tung; "Issues don't drop from the skies, they are manufactured by social practice." Then along came some mysterious article on J.I.O.,, and also the 1971 Admissions Policy, and the Council had, quick as a flash, done what the Labour Club Conference had failed to do, resucitated the Vanguard! Of course Council had to introduce the Admissions Policy for they knew damn well that the students would legitimately be opposed to it, and who leads the student masses on the burning social issues of the day? The Maoists. And what do the Maoists generally do? They fuck everything up. Good, say Council, then we can have an excuse for existing, in fighting those student barbarians. Of course, they may have to expel a few of the John Waynes of the revolutionary movement, because Sir Henry Bolte is angered for he cannot see the rationale for this mutual co-operation between Council and the Maoists. (Sir Henry is stupid - Why else do you think he has held power for seventeen years).

The problem has become so confused under a welter of cliches produced by champions of the age mentally tripping over their dialectic. The Christian community want to bring God into it but if He has any sense he will keep his fingers clean. "What is to be done?" ask the majority of respectable moderate students, just as Lenin

before them asked this question, he also being respectable and moderate. This is not the question. What is to be undone?

My advice to the Council:

- "Don't expel the radicals, they're safer on campus; out of harm's way and out of the way of doing harm.
  To the radicals, vanguard, Maoists, or whatever:

- Don't get rid of Council, the enemy you know is better than the enemy you don't understand.
  To the interested, uninteresting majority of students and staff at La Trobe:

- Beware of David Brown, who was quoted in a morning newspaper last week as saying he wanted La Trobe run by a public servant (it is); this is just a Moderate Student Alliance plot to hand control of the university to Andy Rodger.

  UNDO IT!

THEORY

The anatomy of the University is to be found in the structure of academic space-time. All the forms of administrative - academic superstructure, the rules of academic progress, the hierarchy of academic pseudo-specialists, the disciplinary and admissions policies rise upon this base both as reflections and as guarantors of the existing made of production of academic capital and intellectual proletarians. The real relations of production and reproduction of university life have historically produced and now move beyond a complex and formalised superstructure of institutions in which the real relations of the university appear in the fantastic forms of rules and ruling bodies claiming an independent and eternal validity. This we will call the fetishism of Councils.

"To be a revolutionary the student must first revolt against his studies." In the University, as in the factory, direct action must be taken at the point of production. The struggle against the present organisation of academic space-time must be carried out on the lecture and tutorial front. This struggle is ultimately the struggle against the Degree. It is the positive rejection of bourgeois society. It is the affirmation of the possibility of free intellectual creation and the transcendence of the constraints of class society.

D. INTELLIGENT AND UN-INTELLIGENT STRATEGY: RIGHT, LEFT AND CENTRE ON THE EVE OF AN OCCUPATION (1971)

The hallmark of intelligent political strategy is that it reproduces the desired reality in its means; that the ideal unfolds in the concrete development of willed activity. Intelligent strategy then always overruns its objectives; rather than being merely a means to a formally defined end, it creates the objective basis for further development. Inherently then - unless its aim is the production of automatons - intelligent strategy is democratic, creative and anti-authoritarian, i.e. it is radical.

The radical objective is the willed transformation of everyday reality - the reality of manipulated conformity. Thus a truly radical strategy (and there are many pseudo-radical strategies) is inherently intelligent; conversely an unintelligent strategy propounded by a radical is inherently reactionary, i.e. reformist.

The central problem for intelligent strategy is that reality today is mainly appearance. Behind every formal power structure stands the real power structure - a certain set of social relationships. Behind every formal resolution stands its real meaning, behind that the will and ability to carry it out or frustrate it. Unintelligent strategy identifies the formal with the actual, i.e. the real with the rational in a profoundly irrational world. Intelligent strategy is here already radical since it presupposes the discrimination of the real from its appearance and hence creates a new world in which that appearance stands revealed as a surrogate reality.

Intelligent strategy is honest with itself; although it has secrets from the enemy it has none from its executors. The proliferation of illusions and the creation of an executive class to whom alone reality may be revealed brands a strategy as being counter-radical - its esoteric aim being a new manipulated conformity.

Superficially one might think that there is a mass movement at La Trobe aiming at the repeal of the Admissions Regulations. This is not the case: the agreement on the wording of a few resolutions cannot conceal the fact that there are at least three movements with disparate aims and completely opposed strategy and tactics.

The mere formal act of revocation means different things to different groups: for manipulative liberals and conservatives it would remove a strictly unnecessary regulation which could be used as a rallying point for opposition to the present power structure; for "fair-play" liberals it would remove an apparent anomaly in a supposedly liberal institution; for "ordinary" students it would be a victory for student "solidarity"; for the maoist left it would principally be a victory in a defensive campaign; for the radical left it would be a formal manifestation of the victory of a real counterpower to the University Council and Academic Board. For only some of these groups can the problem of intelligent strategy arise. The analysis of the movement becomes even more complex when it is remembered that it may be tactically better to demand the repeal of a regulation that you hope and expect to maintain in all essentials even if not as a formal ruling.

Manipulative liberals and conservatives have a virtual monopoly of the seats of official power - Council, Academic Board, Deanships and S.R.C. executive. More to the point the rational members of this group are in the majority. Thus a great pretense will be made of consultability and reasonability. One third of the (un) holy trinity (of S.R.C. President, Dean of Education and Vice Chancellor) will send on a motion to another third, two thirds may appear at meetings to tell everyone how reasonable the other third is, the holy spirit may direct his son to distribute his newsheets. Despite the appearance of great activity the three are really One - the ghost speaks to itself.

The ambiguity of maoist politics springs from the tendency to put forward formal - and thus satisfiable - demands whilst believing that reform is impossible. To prevent this contradiction from exploding their system they act according to a mechanistic strategy in which the world is divided into two perfectly separate mutually recognising parts between whom the struggle is total. Thus the apparent and stated objective is never the real objective but only the pretext for rehearsing again an old play. The only permissible way to achieve an end - i.e. appear to be attempting to achieve an end - is to make demands and put forward arguments for them that would only persuade one half of the (conceptually) divided world. The arguments - being only rallying cries - fail to persuade and so immediately the sanction of force can be invoked. Because the mini-struggles of the university are only games by the standards of the world outside the force can only be symbolic force. Thus buildings are occupied or liberated as symbolic counterparts to real occupations or liberations by troops or the armed people. Sooner or later the University - which has power in the real world - intervenes with real force, e.g. expulsions or cops, and the maoists are on the defensive. Real victory is now impossible (formal victory can be achieved) and so they must appeal either overtly or covertly to the university community at large. "Student solidarity" either saves or fails to save the day and academic liberals and student bureaucrats work out the details of a new consensus. Because their strategy is necessarily manipulative (loudly demanding a reform and secretly hoping for a revolution to grow out of the physical clash) the maoists fall prey to more experienced manipulators than themselves. Entangled in the rhetoric of socialist moralism they are easy targets for the totally amoral.

Contrary to the maoists the radical left believes that real gains can be made in the university and that the destruction of the universities (qua universities) does not entail any gains for the left. To give up the universities as arenas of struggle - as the maoists would if they were consistent - is pure capitulationism.

E. TACTICS IN THE STRUGGLE AGAINST THE ADMISSIONS REGULATION. (1971)

The Council, having taken 'cognizance' of student opinion on the subject, has returned the matter of the admissions regulations to the Academic Board for it to formulate a policy for 1972 and after. In doing so it has announced that it will, as in the past, accept the Board's recommendation. Subject to a qualification to be made later this means that effective power in the matter of exclusions rests in the hands of the Academic Board.

This is important for two reasons: firstly, because the Academic Board is at least partially elective and its members are in daily contact with the university and so can be expected, in the long run, to follow the movement of opinion in the university whereas the Council is largely appointed from outside and is potentially out of tune with university opinion. Secondly, because if the issue is clearly with the Academic Board students will be less likely to be diverted into Council sit-ins and Administration occupations which would be ineffectual even if the issue was to be decided by Council.

The Academic Board, whilst being an exceedingly conservative - indeed reactionary-body, can be influenced in that a successful campaign amongst staff and students can make its position, and that of its members, untenable. This is what both the Academic Board and many members of staff fear. To approach the problem realistically we must realise that only a handful of staff are sufficiently "liberated" to oppose the Academic Board publicly. This is not because they are afraid of it; it is because they are afraid of being without it, i.e. they are afraid that a campaign against particular evils, e.g. exclusions, will lead to the loss of the Academic Board's claim to moral authority. Many staff who oppose exclusions, or would if the arguments were presented to them, are prepared to support - i.e. not oppose - the Academic Board on this issue because they don't want to upset the existing power structure. They have adopted the ultra-conservative stance that it does not matter what established power does since it must be supported because it is established. (Cf. the Dreyfus case in France).

Thus the road to revision of the policy is through an attack on the Board's moral authority and an offensive in the name of liberal principle against the vast majority of "liberal" academics. It follows that a successful campaign will not just lead to the scrapping of the policy but must also lead to a fundamental shift of academics towards a more progressive and committed standpoint; it will be a step towards the implantation of the ideals of the university in the La Trobe reality.

It is not easy to make men free. What we are asking is that academics shake themselves free of the institutional values of the academic bureaucracy and act - for the first time in their lives? - as independent and autonomous agents according to the traditional values of intellectuals. They will only do this under heavy pressure because all their experience has been of socialisation into the values of the hierarchy, i.e. into a hierarchy of values in which those of the critical intellectual rate a poor last.

The groundwork for this must be a major effort by students to educate their teachers. All students must talk to academics they know and raise the matter in tutorial discussion. (It would be unwise at this stage for groups of students to visit other students' lectures for it is important that the groundwork is done informally without the appearance of coercion.) We must persuade a certain number of academics to proclaim publicly their dissent from the Academic Board as a preliminary to any general campaign of building up an opposition department by department, school by school.

F. STUDENT NEWSPAPER EDITORIAL (1971)

Once again general questions about the respective rights and duties (sic) of students and Administration and about university discipline proceedings have been raised and the predictable lines are being redrawn. It is rather easy to dismiss all talk of "rights", "law" and "justice" as just so much twaddle but, since legal and ethical concepts and general university mythology are convenient ideological forms

in which students, staff and administrators can become conscious of their differences and fight them out, the matter repays consideration.

Simply because ideological facts are facts it follows that those who talk of "legalistic illusions" are themselves under an illusion. One understands "bourgeois legality" by withdrawing completely from the ideological sphere, not by opposing to it an equally ideological concept of "proletarian (sic.) legality". One opposes to university legality the concept of university tactics, not other purely ideological notions.

The core of the discussion on "university legality" has revolved around the question as to whether university tribunal procedure is governed by Common Law, i.e. whether the evolved **concept** of "justice" current in common law countries can be used to criticise the conduct of university disciplinary hearings. Despite the spectacular success last year of the "natural justice" challenge to the university's proceedings it seems that the university's proceedings need not be conducted in accordance with common law principles of justice.

An extremely important distinction here is that the "natural justice" challenge was the expression of a widespread political movement of staff and students against the 1970 suspensions and derived its efficacy from this as well as serving as a rallying cry for bringing further forces into the campaign against the suspensions. Thus the functioning of the concept was pre-eminently ideological. As a purely legal point for use in court it had some possibilities because of the extra-ordinary nature of the hearings at which the suspensions were handed down, but this was mainly because a ruling against the suspensions on these grounds would not have undermined the validity in general of university disciplinary proceedings. It is otherwise with the projected common law attack on this year's suspensions.

Whilst "contrary to common law" may move the more legalisticly inclined it has far less appeal as a rallying cry then "denial of natural justice". It is a point which can only really be used in court and it can only be used against tribunals which are supposed to operate under common law rules. Thus claiming "violation of common law" will only lead to an argument as to whether university tribunals are legally required to follow common law rules. And this can be answered in the negative - courts have shown quite clearly that they do not expect universities to give students the benefit of common law safeguards. (See Douglas Brown: "Student Discipline and the Law"; Vestes: The Australian Universities Review. March, 1971).

The best starting point for consideration of university discipline procedures is to assume that:

a) By enrolling at the university the student is accepting (in a legal sense) the existing university statutes and regulations and so he or she is accepting any form of disciplinary hearings which can be held under the statutes. The courts would regard disciplinary bodies set up under the statutes as private arbitral bodies agreed to by the student. There is no constraint, other than the statutes, on their mode of operation.

b) If the student wants a degree he or she must at least appear to accept, any demands or regulations the university authorities may, from time to time, care to make. Enrolment in no way implies approval of the university statutes and regulations; a student is in no way morally obliged to the university authorities; it is just a question of whether one will make a gesture of submission to their rules. If one wants a degree one has to be flexible because universities have a monopoly on degree granting and they all make similar demands.

c) Essentially the university authorities have only one sanction, the withholding of a degree (withholding a university place is just withholding the chance to get a degree). Providing there is sufficient staff and student opposition to a particular decision to withhold a degree - or if there is a functioning "free university" or "Genesis scheme" - the university authorities cannot withhold the opportunity to learn, although they can try to interfere by preventing "unofficial" students from coming on

campus. Of course this latter course may not be politically feasible, i.e. it may not be an option open to the Administration.

d) Thus all one's dealings with the university authorities are governed purely by pragmatism; one owes them nothing. Insofar as one is dealing with the bureaucracy the only question is: "Can we get away with it?"

Given this attitude, the only rational one, legal questions occupy only a secondary role. One can only catch out the authorities when they are clearly in conflict with their own rules or the University Act, i.e. when they are in breach of the "contract" into which they have entered with the student. One must also remember that no court would make a decision that in any way would cast doubt on the validity of "normal" university procedure. It would in fact depend heavily on the judge's personality whether a court would rule against the university even in an exceptional case.

The primary question, then, is one of power - understood in a sufficiently wide sense. There are potentially two universities; the legal university of the statutes and administrators and the real university of staff and students. Although students are not represented in any real sense on the bodies that control the university - and hence have no obligation to use "proper" channels and, in general, even less reason to expect anything of them - the academic staff are represented on all university bodies and so it is always possible for the legal university to be (temporarily) captured for use against the authorities or one of their decisions. Possible but improbable! What is more probable is that, in crisis situations in which large and important sections of students and staff move into opposition to the university authorities, the split in the university "community" will be reflected in splits amongst the staff temporarily members of the ruling university bodies and in order to heal this split the high administrators would have to compromise with - or even surrender to - the staff-student opposition (because the university's functioning depends on both concensus politics and the apparent supremacy of the constituted authorities). Thus precisely because students are powerless in formal terms their important demands are achievable only in what could be termed "university-revolutionary situations", i.e. situations in which the administration is stripped of moral authority and appears only as a body which hands out or with withholds scraps of paper.

This situation is only temporary and once the aim of the mass movement is achieved the majority of staff and students settle back and only those who take the administration seriously remain up in arms. In fact the majority attitude is the reasonable one; the university as a legal body will not be destroyed this side of a social revolution and will be handing out degrees until the end of all class society.

Thus one takes university discipline only as seriously as one takes formal qualifications and not even that seriously if the political climate in the university is right. However one takes the violation of their own or society's legality by the university authorities very seriously indeed and quite properly so. The legal university holds all the cards; it writes the conditions of admission and the allowable methods of changing them. All the clauses in the "contract" between the student and the university are written by the authorities. It is not a matter of whom it serves; it is a matter of what it is. The legal university is arbitrary authority; between it and the real university there can be no lasting peace.

NOTES ON ANARCHISM (1971)

Anarchism is the theory and practice of total opposition to God and the State: i.e. total opposition to the historically dominant forms of the Spirit of Authority. The State is not a set of physical power relations for no social relation can be purely physical. The State is a network of relations with both social-co-operative and physical-dominative aspects which have become conceptualised as "authority"

relations and further reified into a thing: the State as pure authority. The Stalino-Liberal-Christian-Judaic God is essentially the State projected into the skies just as in earlier times the State was God's earthly form, his true son.

Wherever one man submits to another the State is present in embryo. There are only two reasons for bowing to another which are currently permissible: because of the other's knowledge or because of the other's physical power. To do so for any other reason is to reconstitute authority in its most pernicious forms. However because in historical societies the clarity of relationships between men has disappeared and has been replaced by the mysification of relations between men and things outside men (Society, Knowledge, Authority, etc.) the tendency is for both knowledge and power to be assimilated into the one benevolent despotism; the Authority or the State. Thus the revolutionary project is the international power of the Workers' Councils, i.e. that unmediated proletarian power which strips all social relationships of their mysterious mediated quality. Direct workers' democracy is the realisation of the revolutionary project of man's dealienation.

The modern proletariat, the world revolutionary class, consists of those who lack power over their everyday lives and know it. Their project, the seizure of that power, is thus also the destruction of all power separately conceived.

The development of revolutionary theory, the transcendence of the spectacular oppositions of the 1st International, proceeds with the development of revolutionary action. All theory is judged by its consistency with the revolutionary democracy of the Workers' Councils. The test of a revolutionary is adherence to the essential theses of the great proletarian revolutions of Paris 1871, Russia 1905 & 1917, Kronstadt 1921, Asturias 1934, Barcelona 1936, and the East European revolution of 1953 to today. Revolutionary movement is proletarian self-activity; any movement which neglects this truth is revealed as, at most, a movement of social reform however "revolutionary" its ideology.

An anarchist examines the theory not the ideology. Ideology as the affirmation of the spectacle is the enemy of all revolutionary theory. Theory is logical, ideology sociological. Radical logic, which negates ideology, bridges the gap between the practice of criticism and the criticism of practice. Since "what you steal becomes your own", revolutionary plagiarism is a necessary moment of theoretical advance.

Theorising is also a practical activity. Praxis - the revolutionary transformation of reality - is thus also a transformation of theory. To oppose theory and practice, to not see them as a dialectical unity, is to surrender to positivism. Theory is not mere thought, nor practice mere action.

To conceive practice as spectacular action is the mark of the alienated lumpen-intelligentsia. The worker at least perceives practice to be part of everyday life even if he does not also conceive it as its transcendence. Thus the intellectual tends towards adventurism and the worker towards economism with the important difference that the worker is subject to the check of everyday reality which eventually must demand its transcendence.

Since the individual is defined by his situation and reproduces himself in his everyday life, he demands the power to create situations worthy of his desire by the control of his everyday life. Every individual act of insurrection thus foreshadows total proletarian revolution.

Revolutionary action is conscious exemplary insurrection. Revolutionary theory aims at the clarification of that consciousness through the medium of critical theory. The ultimate aim of revolutionary theory is its self-liquidation as separate theory when that consciousness becomes conscious of itself as the action-theory of the revolutionary proletariat. Revolutionary organisation as the carrier of revolutionary theory and the agent of exemplary insurrection likewise dissolves in the general movement.

Situationist Faction
La Trobe Anarchists

IDEALISM DIES (1971)

Essential to the Anarchistic achievement of a society organised without authority, whereby mutual relationships are governed by mutual agreements and not by laws of manipulative, exploitive financial tactics, is full respect for the Individual Mind, (i.e. YOU). An inherent condition for the practice of such respect is the absence of dogma, so that the importance of the Human Being is stressed above the concept of the citizen of the state which attempts to dehumanise Mankind by treating PEOPLE as statistics classified into various distributions. It is in a cause such as this that resides our determination to bring about the death of the dogmatic, oppressive fascist state, whether it occurs in the form of Western imperialism or Eastern aggressive expansionism. We cannot differentiate between the invasion of Indo-China by the Western Fascists and the invasion of Hungary or Czechoslavakia by the Eastern Fascists, also known, deceptively enough, as "Communists, both types trying to ease their evil-oriented consciences by almost convincing themselves to believe the most barbaric excuse of recorded history: "We are acting in the interests of the majority," and thus acting like all good demagogic pseudo-democrats should. "The Majority" is but a bureaucratic myth, designed to justify self-interested, oppressive policy - we recognise only the individuals making up such a majority.* The difference is of course that the Capitalistic "majority" consists of the nouveau-riche, again deceptively known under the innocent title of "liberals," while the communist Ruling Classes like to think that the Proletariat is the dynamic force behind the Governmental machinary, knowing full well that Workers' Control has proven to be another myth, only to be achieved when the all-sacred top-heavy bureaucracy meets its downfall at the hands of the Nihilists, who Lenin thought to have successfully smashed but who, nevertheless, have still managed an attempt at an underground paper circulation.

(* 'majority' - a peculiar termindogical phenomenon, bureaucratic in origin, defined by a lexicographer who should know better as "whereby votes cast on one side exceed those on the other").'

Anarchists therefore find it very difficult to explain the world fuck-up in terms of clashing ideologies. All present governments are repressive, all oppress the individual - the difference between governments is a difference in name only. Despite ideological unity, however, the fascists are finding it difficult to co-operate in view of their clashing selfish nationalistic policies. Anarchists have therefore disposed of their Maoist tendencies almost as readily as they have lost hope in the efficiency of supporting ANY form of authority.

"We must affirm the new principles of the Party:

(i) The Individual is subordinate to the Organisation.

(ii) The minority is subordinate to the Majority.

(iii) The lower level is subordinate to the higher level.

(iv) The entire membership is subordinate to the Central Committee."

This quotation is not from "Mein Kampf" but rather from "Thoughts of Chairman Mao" - similar authoritarian garbage is to be found in the works of other hierarchically minded rulers.

ALL GOVERNMENTS ARE BY NECESSITY CONSERVATIVE AND ANTI-REVOLUTIONARY, SOME, LIKE THE CHINESE, MAKE HONEST EFFORTS TO PRESERVE THE REVOLUTION, BUT INEVITABLY, MUST SUCCUMB TO THE DEMANDS OF AN AUTHORITARIAN BUREAUCRACY. IDEALISM DIES. THE PRINCIPLES OF LIBERTY, FRATERNITY AND EQUALITY WHICH HAVE BEEN THE ASPIRATIONS OF ALL REVOLUTIONS IN THEORY, ARE UTTERLY DENIED BY AUTHORITY AND GOVERNMENTS.

"We are not afraid of ruins. We shall inherit the earth. The Bourgeoisie may blast and ruin its World before it leaves the stage of history. We carry a new world here in our hearts-that world is growing this minute." - Buenarentura Durruti on behalf of the Anarchist Revolution. (Spain).

"Anarchy is society organised without authority."

- Errico Malatesta

MARXIST ECONOMICS AND THE SPECTACULAR ECONOMY. INTRODUCTION TO 'TIME AND LABOUR' FROM GUY DEBORD: SOCIETY OF THE SPECTACLE (1971)

The situationists do not indulge in the sterile and academic exercise of bringing Marx "up to date" nor do they engage in lengthy critiques of specific Marxist theses, but their work, even apart from their adoption of the style of the "Theses on Feuerbach", would be inexplicable without that of Marx. The following section of "Society of the Spectacle" by Guy Debord re-examines the exploitation of the proletariat and the alienation of the labourer under the conditions of advanced capitalism.

The **alienation** of labour always had two sides in Marxism; the so-called objective side of the alienation of the products of labour from the labourer with which are bound up the concepts of value and rate of exploitation, and the so-called subjective side of the alienation of the labourer from the possibilities inherent in him as a human being in a society at a certain level of social development. Although circumstances contrived to swing Marx from an emphasis on the subjective aspect (in the "1844 Manuscripts") to an emphasis on the objective aspect (in "Capital") there is no question of the two not being aspects of the one process and in the "Grundrisse" the two aspects appear together. One of the main factors behind this change of emphasis attendant upon Marx's decision to devote his time to the elucidation of the objective aspects of the alienation of labour was Marx's, correct, conviction that political economy was the key to understanding bourgeois society and that for this a full development of the "objective" side of alienation (i.e. the capitalistic appropriation of surplus value) was necessary. Another important factor was that at no stage during Marx's lifetime was the level of social wealth sufficient to offer everyone the chance to develop themselves to the extent postulated for a communist society. Although a great deal could be done to alleviate the conditions of the working class, and the possibilities for working class advancement were great compared with the actuality of working class conditions, "utopia" was still unattainable and the disparity between what man was and what he could be was not yet a revolutionary issue except insofar as it was linked with the social fact of exploitation. Today the position has changed.

In advanced capitalist countries the Marxian value theory has ceased to be the keen analytical tool it once was because workers are no longer paid according to their labour value. There are a complex of reasons for this - capitalist benevolence not being amongst them - but the fact by itself is sufficient to render the value analysis of little critical importance for the analysis of advanced capitalism. (It can still be applied to the analysis of the socialist countries and to the less modern sectors of advanced countries but the essence of the matter is that as capital accumulates the balancing of supply and demand and the maintenance of a uniform rate of profit across the economy implies that labour will be paid above its value and so the theoretical rate of surplus value will differ from the actual rate of accumulation and the wage rate will no longer be a subsistence one. This difficulty, which arises from the equations of expanded reproduction, suggests that there is a post-marxian phase of capital accumulation which can be predicted from the marxian analysis of the earlier stage and reasonable assumptions on the political strength of the working class movement.) On the other hand the accumulation of social wealth over the past century has created unprecedented possibilities for development (and destruction) in the advanced countries. The disparity between the way we live and the way we could live is becoming a political issue. This amounts to a rejection of the model of human nature foisted onto man by capitalism.

(Forms of society create their own character structure). In particular the idea of work is being subjected to critical scrutiny in those countries pastthe initial phase of capital accumulation. Because of this it is necessary to re-examine the **alienation** of the labourer in those aspects most relevant to advanced capitalism.

The aspect that Debord fixes on is the expropriation of the labourer's free time, i.e. his life activity, and its return to him as commodities, some of which impose themselves as an alien consumption time on his remaining free time. In reading Debord's work it must be remembered that whereas the model of classical capitalism presupposed that all commodities were private goods, the modern economy not only accumulates wealth as goods but disipates wealth as spectacles. Just as in the ancient societies of Egypt, South America and Mesopotamia the dominant mode of consumption of social wealth beyond subsistence is by the production of objects for passive contemplation.

BE AN ALIEN (1971)

"I am a citizen of the World" - Tom Paine.

A fundamental principle of Anarchist Philosophy is the unity of Mankind. Implicit in this idea is the right to travel without restriction or harrassment wherever YOU desire on YOUR planet.

Nationalism is a base emotion of prehistoric origin (see the Territorial Imperative) which has no true place in modern international society. Yet it remains as a tool of the Ruling Class, who, instead of using their propaganda machines to promote understanding and harmony, continue to create a climate of ignorance and fear for themselves to exploit when needed. They promote the idea of National Unity against outsiders to the virtual exclusion of the Ideal of International People's Unity against the exploiting classes. The usefulness of this pool of national hysteria to such exploiters is virtually unlimited and includes such things as campaigns to "BUY AUSTRALIAN" regardless of how shithouse the product is, and the recurring "Yellow Hordes" every election time as an extremely efficient way of recruiting for their criminal wars. The People have nothing to gain from fighting in the expansionist wars between their nationally-based masters - THEY'LL still be slaves anyway - and yet they DO fight; a testimony to the callous efficiency of the exploiters' propaganda weapons.

ALIEN REGISTRATION

In Australia, we have a Department for the Control of National Purity ("officially" known as the Immigration Department). Its entire terms of reference are racist and chauvinist. Our opposition to the Immigration Department is total and not confined to our absolute contempt of the "White Australia Policy" - THE IMMIGRATION DEPARTMENT EXISTS TO RESTRICT THE MOVEMENT OF MEN OVER THEIR PLANET.

Every September, this department conducts a sordid little manoeuvre known as "Alien Registration". Now an Alien is not small and green with big pointy ears (that's a McMahon), but anyone who is not an Australian, British citizen, etc., they must answer a variety of personal and impertinent questions for the department.

This is counter to anarchist principles (see last copy of "TREASON"). It represents bureaucratic prying and muddling into the lives of INDIVIDUALS; it also implies that certain people are considered aliens in one part of the planet because they were born on a different part of the ONE PLANET.

DEATH TO ANACHRONISTIC ANTIPODEAN-XENOPHOBIC NATIONALISM !!

The Immigration Department has never experienced anarchistic direct action - they would have less idea how to handle a falsie than would the Department of Labour and National Servitude. Anything that balls up any government department is worth doing.

FILL IN FALSE ALIEN REGISTRATION FORMS !

Advice:

They can be obtained at any money-order post-office in theoretically unrestricted numbers.

- Marital Status - never married
- Occupation - non-professional
- Former Family name - unchanged
- Name - Yours or an imaginary one.
- Registration.No.- Don't put one - they are quite often forgotten.

THE UNIVERSITY AS PRODUCTION AND CONSUMPTION (1971)

Although universities are probably the fastest growing sector of the economy in terms of consumption of GNP and although politicians presumably see education in terms

of the creation of human capital, one might wish to object that the difference between a university and a technical college is that there is something more than this to a university. This 'something' would probably be identified as research, but since the university presents itself as a predominantly undergraduate institution I will restrict myself to this aspect. Broadly what I will try to do is give an account of undergraduate education in terms of what is produced and who is consumed.

It is worth considering the possibility that although the government pours money into the universities the economy may not be getting much out of them. In particular the government may be misleading itself (and the electors) in speaking of 'human capital', i.e. capital embodied as skills in a labourer, produced by universities. Universities are not the only possible source of human capital; even Victorian technical schools produce 'human capital' in the sense that they turn out young workers with certain skills.

It is clear, I think, that there are 'relative' and (relatively) 'absolute' senses of 'human capital'. Any industrial system will need technical school products together with some scientists and engineers, but the demand for administrative workers is socially and historically determined and so is the demand for special qualifications in administrative workers. (On the face of it they need only be literate and, perhaps, numerate). While it might be true that a certain number of functionaries is necessary for the functioning of an industrial system it is by no means the case that the actual number employed is determined by economic or technical considerations. Studies have shown that the ratio of administrative to productive workers in modern industry can vary from country to country and sector to sector more or less independently of technology; this means that the demand for administrative workers is in fact determined by social structure rather than by productive rationality in a narrow sense. Thus the 'value' of administrative 'human capital' cannot be derived realistically from the current state of technology and the 'value' of the university product cannot be derived by computing the discounted future salaries of graduates, since in each case the procedure confuses the value to the community in terms of possible production with the market value determined by a certain socio-political organisation of production and so takes the socially determined income structure - which historically reflects the interests of ruling groups - to be a reflection of economic necessities for the society as a whole. To make what I am getting at clearer it is worthwhile considering two simple models of the university before proceeding to the analysis of the modern university.

The university will be part of the economy even if it is a private body and does not produce any 'output'. Aristotle's Lyceum was a body devoted to the pursuit of knowledge, i.e. a scholarly university; it did not claim to supply trained personnel to outside society although it did claim that the educated man was a better citizen.

Economically, however, it consumed, through the personal consumption of the non-productive teachers and students, a part of a social surplus created by slaves and free workers. Insofar as people engage in full time teaching or study they require social support or must have previously accumulated sufficient capital - which in all societies governed by scarcity must be done at the expense of others. Thus a scholarly university consumes part of the social surplus but does not contribute anything to the economy. It may advance practical knowledge (science) and thus benefit future society but its main purpose is the creation, elaboration and dissemination of culture. Because 'culture' cannot be quantified and is not 'useful' it is infinitely more likely that such a university will be a private one in an aristocratic society than a state one in a capitalist or bureaucratic society. However it is also obvious that culture is a gain to society, although perhaps an unjustifiable one if most of the society is excluded from its enjoyment while paying for its production.

The university in the feudal period, while carrying on the scholarly tradition, was also professional: it trained people to fill certain roles in society. Trained professionals are pre-eminently a form of 'human capital', but it should be noted that the professionals produced were lawyers and priests and one could not say that society

as a whole needed them. Their roles arose through a certain class division of society which needed a layer to mediate between peasants and nobles. Typically they were recruited from the commons, for nobles didn't need to do anything for a living, and so education for such a position was a means of upward social mobility. Thus one could say that university training was an entrance ticket to the middle ranks of society and thus became with their growth the specific mode of reproduction of the middle ranks. The social function of the university was to maintain the division of society by providing an avenue of upward mobility and by providing a means of reproduction of the middle ranks. (Since these were defined functionally rather than by property ownership, there had to be a means by which their children could be confirmed into the same functions; in the post-bourgeois society the same holds for the 'new middle class', i.e. the white collar and professional 'salaretariat'). The economic function of the university was to provide the personnel to maintain the existing social economy. Thus, while the university made no contribution to net output but consumed part of the social product, it was by no means undesirable to the ruling class (unlike the scholarly university which would have been) for the maintenance of the existing income distribution by other means would have cost money.

I suggest that if one excepts Medicine and certain technical professions which, as many people have pointed out, could as well or better be taught away from the universities, then the socio-economic analysis of the university would proceed as follows:

1. The university exists only where a social surplus exists which can be appropriated privately or by a government.

2. Insofar as it is scholarly it can benefit society as a whole by the disinterested pursuit of science and by the creation, maintenance and elaboration of a culture which, potentially at least, exists for the whole society.

3. Insofar as its degrees are accepted and sought after as entrees to middle class society it serves as a major prop to the existing social order. This shows that the government's investment is not so much in 'human capital', i.e. skilled labour, as in 'correct' attitudes, i.e. achievement orientation, enthusiastic acceptance of status gradations, etc. What is created by the investment is the personnel for manning the infrastructure of hierarchical society. It is essential for maintaining hierarchical society that the infrastructure considers itself 'above' the base; the proletarianisation of the infrastructure created by the advance of technological society puts this project in question (and thus creates the need for a new theory of the intellectually trained).

The conclusion is that investment in 'human capital' in the universities cannot be considered as social investment because only a part, principally composed of the part for engineering, medicine and technology, is socially productive; the rest is investment in maintaining the established division of society.

This completes the discussion of the socio-economic aspect of the university; there remains the potentially more interesting question as to its internal workings.

If one asks what the university does, one could answer that it takes in semi-literate, immature matriculants and turns out semi-literate, immature graduates. What the graduate has gained is a certificate; what he or she has lost is his or her time or, more forcefully, part of his or her life. It is this transaction that demands examination.

If one considers what the undergraduate does, the conclusion is that he or she buys time. That is to say that the student purchases a 'slab' of time equipped with special properties. This slab of time is fixed; its properties are determinate and laid down in advance. The time is not free time because even if it does not define activities proceeding continuously throughout it, the fact that the activities are fixed in the time casts a shadow backwards. Freedom is purchased at the expense of future academic time. If one asks where this time comes from the answer is that it comes from the student's life. The student insofar as he or she keeps the bargain, or better still, joins in the game, gives up part of his or her life, i.e. unlimited possibility of free creation, and receives in return a piece of academic time - a

subspecies of general labour time. Thus the student gives potentiality and receives an alien actuality just as the labourer gives up life to receive survival. The price paid for entering the transaction is in each case the price of maintaining hierarchical society.

The university, typically conceived as a super high school where no one tells you what to do, is desired precisely in the proportion that its representation is separate from the desirer, that is, in the proportion that the student is ignorant of the actual social relations that constitute the university. The phoney categories associated with the university by the popular press - the 'student life', student demonstrations, student pranks, student sex, etc. - are intended both to titillate the popular mind and to mystify the consumers of the banal reality. (Many students still learn what is happening at their university by reading the newspapers - just as many demonstrators do not believe in the reality of their actions until they see them on T.V. or read about them in the papers). That university education is desirable is a postulate of our culture; studies have shown that the reasons for applying for and attending university have little to do with either its academic or 'professional' aspects (except in the limited sense of 'getting-on': surprisingly, other methods of getting-on are not perceived as desirable). University (pseudo-) education is a value just like (pseudo-) democracy.

The structure of academic time is not determined by the student. The academic year is almost completely externally determined and the game of academic progress has very few moves. Despite phoney consultative and concensus techniques the determination of academic time is done from outside the student ranks; the student's life is externally determined.

So much is obvious; it is less obvious who does determine the structure of academic time. The larger aspects such as the three term annual exam structure are determined by our old friend the Academic Board, in the past its decisions being made according to tradition and in the future to be made according to cost-effectiveness studies and its balance of prejudice.

Questions about courses and unit structures are settled in a complex fashion between Departments, Schools and the Board. 'Hurdles' (assessment techniques) are mainly the prerogative of the Department but are subject to interference by the Board. Thus the individual academic does not control academic time, i.e. he does not control his labour, although, in general, academics are still free to choose their style of work. Although he may have a voice in departmental decisions these are usually subject to higher authority and even at the departmental level decisions do not reflect individual desires. Apart from satisfying certain economic constraints decisions must be consistent with all other decisions taken in the university and consequently creation of dangerous precedents must be avoided; if a new course is being introduced, or a radical alteration of a course being proposed, then it must be justified in existing terms, e.g. be 'academic', be 'central' be 'teachable', etc., and must 'fit-in' with existing courses. The determining background of decisions is thus the total institution; the university is not a democratic, self-governing 'community of scholars'. It is a bureaucratic institution weighed down by its past and shackled by budgets. Academic time is not a local creation of particular academics, it is globally unified across units and departments, through sequences and years, university by university.

Academic progress is not yet purely existence in academic time. The existence of a limited number of distinct moves at the beginning of each year requires the consideration of academic space. Academic progress is a trajectory in academic space-time; academic time is the form of academic life, academic space is its content. Academic space is the deployment of specialisms over the face of that reality currently deemed worthy of study and to the academic this set of specialisms appears both as discrete and as exhausting reality. The general reason for this is that the reality studied is created by, or structured by, previous specialisms and the evolution of the specialisms (disciplines) reflects the results of operations upon this reality. More importantly, particularly for the discreteness of the specialisms, is the fact that nearly all theoretic study of the reality is carried out by university-trained specialists at universities and universities are, as was previously pointed out, hierarchically and bureaucratically organised bodies within which the separateness of disciplines is a necessary result of their rational organisation. Thus the limited number of moves in the academic progress game arises from the

institutionalisation of content as well as form. Thus insofar as mind conforms to reality and (partial) reality is the creation of the university it might be said that the chief product of the university is limited and standardised minds.

Student criticisms of academic matters rarely rise above 'critiques' of particular courses or objections to particular marking and examination practices. There may be virtue, from a student's point of view, in distributing the exam load and there may be virtue in continuous assessment. However, I do not believe that there is, and while these sorts of moves may force students to work harder and so pass (students are fairly masochistic) it seems that they intensify the oppressive nature of academic time. Of course if these sorts of moves do lead to the destruction or watering down, of academic time, then they are to be commended although students seem uneasy when the destructuring of academic time is mooted.

More dis-directed yet are demands for relevant, hip or interdisciplinary courses; there is no special virtue in these. To submit to an interdisciplinary course's discipline is just like submitting to any other course. If students had a hand in its introduction they might enjoy it more (it may even be what they wanted), but what of next year's students if it is continued? Only a few courses can be changed each year. The peculiar idea that university is a grim experience because of the things taught arises because students accept the structure in which things are taught; admittedly most courses at university are boring but then again most courses are 'deduced' from institutional constraints. Their extent and direction are fixed by these constraints which also imply their internal structure. To slightly change the set of specialisms does not affect the academic progress game; academic space-time still exists.

The conclusion is that the nature of the university as a bureaucratic, traditional and hierarchical institution implies that there shall be academic space. This, together with the university's function of certification for middle-class society, ensures that there shall be academic time. Conversely the unitised nature of academic time requires discrete academic space to support it.

The influence of academic space-time means that academic progress is a game in which pursuit of the main goal, certification, entails sacrifice of developmental and scholarly goals such as the desire to acquire a general culture or the desire to make anintensive study of a certain area. This game is generally played against the student's own ignorance, but in above-average students who do not fit exactly into the paths mapped out it becomes a game against the academic bureaucracy. The fact that this game is generally lost ensures that the peripheral scholarly aspects of the university, those that serve society in unquantifiable ways, never threaten to override its main function of promoting the production or reproduction of middle-class functionaries, graduates who have the required certificate and half-trained minds.

ANARCHISM AND HISTORY (1971)

1. Anarchism is the theory and practice of total opposition to God and the State, that is, total opposition to the historically dominant forms of the Spirit of Authority.

By "historically dominant" is meant the dominance within real experienced history which belongs as such only to the Nation-State and the Stalino-Liberal-Christian-Judaic God. In a static society, that is one in which both the sacred and the secular are just aspects of the organization of the one unitary society conceived as both natural and eternal, the thought of anarchism cannot arise. Prior to the modern period only isolated individuals have made any approach to distinctively anarchist concepts and to our knowledge this has only been achieved in societies given a real history by the clash of rival powers disrupting the traditional fabric of society. As a system of thought anarchism could only arise in reaction to the monopolisation of history by a single deity and his earthly representative the modern nation-state.

For the God of the West stood outside nature but inside history, in contradistinction to all previous Gods, who only were inside history insofar as they were part of the natural order. Right from the start there was a contradiction in a God radically separate from the world of things, and thus from sub-historical man, who yet claimed

the right to make an end to man's history and thus provide history with a meaning, a meaning which man was supposed unable to give it. For a while the myth of Jesus, the God-made-man, seemed to provide a solution to this paradox - if only in a symbolic and allegorical sense - but with the mathematisation of the universe into infinite space by Newton and the Seventeenth century scientists it became increasingly obvious that God was nowhere; he was not outside space and time because Newtonian space-time left nothing outside it, but it was equally silly to suppose him inside the universe and the theologians had never said that he was. Thus was God banished from the world. But even as the atomism of the new science banished God from the universe, atomism in political philosophy was preparing his return as the State.

From the dawn of christian civilization in the West power and religion have interpenetrated. Initially the West was theoretically united politically as the Holy Roman Empire and religiously as (catholic) christendom. Although this unity was soon reduced to a facade by power struggles for the right of succession to the two seats of power, and completely fractured by the logic of economics, geography and demography, the chief beneficiaries of the decay - the embryonic nation states - were blessed by the pope (for a price) and the new doctrines of the Divine Right of Kings and every King an Emperor in his own domain were developed to ensure the continued identity of power and religion. The shifting balance of power between the local monarchs and the (theoretically universal) papacy soon reached the point at which it was obvious that all clergy were national clergy even if they were not, as in England, nationalized. The first duty of the orthodox christian was worship of the state.

But this result, although implicit in the very premises of Western civilization, was only achieved by real historical movement. The ultimate identity of heavenly power and earthly power, the feudal lord and the heavenly lord, is only clear from a higher vantage point. The divinization of the state and the secularization of religion proceeded through national wars, struggles of church and state and, most importantly, religious wars in which atomism in morals - a harbinger of the bourgeoisie - joined withpeasant revolt to change the whole apparatus of church and state. Thus the very forces which had helped realise God on earth as the nation-state foreshadowed His destruction.

Although undertaken in the name of religion the peasant wars and rebellions had raised the demand for freedom from earthly rulers and the advance of theoretical atomism; which had banished God from the skies, reinstated him on earth as the Monarch or the State only at the cost of recognizing the theoretical possibility of statelessness or atheism in politics. The medieval oppositions, viz man/state and world/God, which really just expressed the same opposition, were displaced by the new oppositions man/nature - which underlay early economic philosophy - and people/rulers - which underlay Machievelli's revision of medieval political theory. Revolutionary bourgeois thought worked this over and they culminated in Hegel's opposition of civil society/state, and Rousseau's opposition of natural man/state. This discovery that the state was erected on other social formations and was not an eternal form prepared the way for its banishment from history just as the earlier discovery of the notion of infinite space had banished God from the universe.

Thus it is clear that, quite independently of the ideological form of its presentation, the discovery that man is free, i.e. makes his own history in an understandable world, is implicit in the development of Western civilization. Thus anarchism, as the demand that man be freed from God and the State, quite naturally arises along with its progressive realization.

2. If anarchism is rooted in history in this way, then it stands in no special need of theoretical support. However in the absence of an understanding of the real movement which has produced anarchism it is possible to identify the ideological forms which produced and accompanied the decay of traditional order as the sources of anarchist doctrine - thus implicitly degrading anarchism from knowledge to ideology. If this were the case then anarchism would be essentially an amalgam of extreme liberalism in politics with protestantism in ethics but, despite some similarities, it is different. The connection is not that anarchism is a continuation or development of these doctrines but that it is a completely different movement which in some retarded countries, e.g. Spain, (partially) played the

part that liberalism and protestantism had previously played in more developed countries. (Just as Marxism unsuccessfully played the part of liberalism in Germany.)

Of the early anarchists Godwin and Proudhon came closest to fitting the ideological continuation model but of these Godwin was never an influence on the historical movement. Proudhon, while taking as his point of departure the French revolution, passed through an anarchist stage - throughout which he adhered to economic liberalism as a description of rational economics - and then further to a more conservative stage in which he dismantled elements of his anarchist system. He was an influence on Spanish liberalism and was in his non-economic, i.e. non-liberal, ideas a point of departure for Bakunin. Starting with Bakunin, though, anarchism broke decisively with liberalism and became a revolutionary alternative to it. There is no "peaceful evolution" of liberalism and protestantism into anarchism; liberalism takes its stand on "freedom from" guaranteed by the State and protestantism on the authority of "internalized" laws of God. Anarchism bases itself on positive freedom, "freedom to", which implies the negation of both the State and God.

The sole element anarchism inherits from the traditions of protestantism and liberalism is the "proof" - which itself involves their transcedence - that there can be no politico-moral obligation, i.e. that you never have the duty to do what the authorities tell you, that you have no obligations to God and the State.

3. The merely negative realization that one has no obligations to rulers does not yet imply the practical overthrow of the state and in the nature of the case no purely theoretical result could. But if anarchism is the thought of a truly human history made freely by man, i.e. society, then the State, as the chief contemporary body claiming the monopoly of history, is doomed insofar as freedom is realized. But since the State only exists insofar as it can monopolize history (and direct all social life) it is necessarily organized to prevent man making his own history. Thus in the struggle for a human history the State is the enemy. No thesis demands the destruction of the State but man's consciousness of himself as the conscious maker of history will imply it.

4. When a human history is achieved it will not be a history of wars and conquest. Neither will it be a history of Gross National Products and profit rates. It will be a history of everyday life, in fact history will be the ensemble of everyone's lives. History when truly the product of the masses themselves will necessarily be the history of the masses. Then history will be rewritten as the activity of self-liberation, a history of the class struggle the aim of which is to put the means of sustaining life into the hands of the living. Thus in the final analysis anarchism is the consciousness of the aim of the revolution.

FROM A MAY DAY NEWSPAPER (1972)

May 1st, international workers' day, is not just an occasion for another protest march. It is the international festival of the working class; dedicated both to the martyrs of the past and the victories of the future. May Day is the symbol of the existence of an alternative to the world of today.

Today we celebrate May Day in the knowledge that the old workingclass movement has collapsed. In the East the old leadership has either been liquidated or has become a new ruling class; in the West the majority of labor parties have become the willing servants of the old order. As a consequence the weaker countries of the world, whichever political bloc they are part of, have become subject to the dictatorship - whether military, political or economic - of the leading world powers: the U.S.A., Russia, Europe and now China and Japan.

Behind this development lies the central fact of world resource scarcity. The gearing of the world economic system to the large-scale production of military hardware and U.S. style consumer "luxury" goods threatens to exhaust the world's supplies of rawmaterials by early next century. The application of science to agriculture may save the inhabitants of the underdeveloped countries from mass starvation long enough to witness the total collapse of the economic system of the developed countries. The sole legacy of this system will be the poisoning of land, air and water that it has brought about.

The Eight Hour Day Movement demanded:

> "Eight hours to work; eight hours to play;
> Eight hours to sleep; eight bob a day".

For a while it seemed that these demands could only be achieved by a revolutionary overthrow of capitalist society. Later, as the demands were progressively satisfied and the workers granted a junior partnership in capitalist society (now grown immeasurably richer), the unions and labor parties lost their revolutionary perspective. Today we can see in what sense the demands were only partly satisfied and how the manner of their satisfaction has led the world to the current crisis situation.

The old workers' movement wanted more than just adequate food, shalter and rest for the working class. The workers wanted to be fully developed as individuals. The aim was cultural and educational as well as political and economic advancement. Social and political equality were to flow from the control by the working classes of the economy. As the song went during the Spanish Civil War (the last gasp of the old workers' movement):

> "He wants no servant under him
> and no boss over his head".

Mass production is the secret of the fantastic wealth of the developed countries and hence the secret of the fantastic wealth of their capitalist classes. It is also more than this; it is the basis of consumerism: the dictatorship of the bourgeois over the proletariat in the sphere of consumption. It cannot be denied that the working class in the developed countries have shared in the vast increase in social wealth over the past 100 years. However, they did not themselves make the choice to consume this increase of wealth as an increase in the quantity of consumer goods rather than as a real change in the quality of their lives. In the rush to satisfy purely material needs the wider choices were ignored. Nor could these choices be made by individuals. The decision as to what type of person a society shall produce, if it can be made consciously, can only be made by the people as a whole. The increase in the productive powers of the economy was directed, not to consciously chosen aims, but by the market itself to the further increase of the productive powers of the economy. This very increase in the size of the economy decreed further choices: to allow the development of slums and then to profitably reclaim them; to accumulate huge concentrations of population requiring the development of monolithic transport industries to serve them; to produce occupational neuroses and work fatigue, thus allowing the creation of whole industries based around tranquilizers, pre-packaged vacations and psychoanalysis. Soon there will be large-scale air and water purification industries: economic necessities create their own economic necessity.

The precondition for this immense accumulation was the extension of the market. Once released from the slavery of the factory, the worker was set upon by a whole corps of advisers, salesmen and hire-purchase agents, all with the aim of getting him to consume what the market had decreed should be produced.

The workers have the eight hour day, but they have to work longer to pay their hire purchase commitments. They have their eight hours to sleep, and they need them because not only is work exhausting, but also because travelling to and from work is increasingly exhausting. What with overtime and travelling most workers don't have eight hours to play, but who feels like it anymore?

The bosses and bureaucrats cannot be allowed to go on creating poisoned air, congested roads, and crippled and under-developed lives for the majority and profits for the minority (themselves). The redirection of the world's industrial system and the

creation and satisfaction of new non-material needs must be achieved. This cannot and will not be done by a handful of bureaucrats following the directions of a government elected by the newspaper magnates. The planning of the new industrial system and the dis-accumulation of population that it will require, can only be by the people themselves. This can be done only by the direct intervention of the workers in production, by participant managed organizations and communities, by the seizure of the accumulated assets of the ruling class, and by individual involvement in the determination of one's quality of life. No bureaucrats can do this for you, no party can do this for you, no government can do this for you.

The aim must be workers' self-management of a new, rationally planned world.

MARCH ON MAY 1ST. MEET 11.00 A.M.

EIGHT-HOUR DAY MONUMENT OPP. TRADES HALL.

ANARCHISM AGAINST MAOISM (1972)

The kind of society that anarchists and libertarian socialists strive for is a society which is free and socialist. A free society makes no attempt to suppress or oppress any lifestyle and does not interfere with the cultural (in the broadest sense of the word) freedom of any individual or group. A necessary condition for the establishment of the free society includes the destruction of the patriachal nuclear family and its specific forms of sexual behavior. These forms of behavior repress natural sexuality. Sexual liberation involves every member of society; heterosexuals as well as homosexuals, bisexuals and autosexuals. Cultural chauvinism, a product of sexual and economic repression, disappears only when the forces of repression have been overthrown.

A socialist society requires the destruction of hierachical authority relationships at all levels of society - the family, the work situation and the government of society. A socialist society is attained when the people involved in the production process consciously control that process, with each person's option carrying equal weight. Such control does not only include the 'conditions of work'. It involves control of the content of production as well. Management as something separate from the point of production cannot exist in a socialist society. There cannot be a managerial class in a socialist society. Likewise there cannot be a group of decision makers and administrators separated from the masses. Every person must have an equal opportunity to participate in all decisions, and all decisions must be made by the masses themselves - not by individuals or groups representing or pretending to represent the masses.

We see the basis for revolutionary change in society as a dual thrust for socialism and freedom. Any analysis of revolutionary change ignoring this leads to new forms of mystification. For example W.S.A. newssheets continually tell us that the main enemy of the peoples of Australia (and other parts of the world) is U.S. Imperialism, and imply that all will be well when the people overthrow U.S. Imperialism. The only analysis undertaken by W.S.A. is a crude economism. In simple terms U.S. Imperialism is an enemy of the people. But it is only one (probably the most important one) example of a much broader phenomenon - that of massive oppression by an advanced technological society. An analysis of U.S. Imperialism must be based on its modes of economic, sexual and cultural oppression.

One must examine the role of the masses and the degree to which they support the system. W.S.A. has done a small amount of the analysis of U.S. Imperialism by examining the economic and political roles of some of the large U.S. corporations in Australia, Indo-China and elsewhere. We consider this to be only one small part of a complete analysis of U.S. Imperialism.

Essentially W.S.A. is using 'U.S. Imperialism' as a scapegoat - a focus for hatred which removes the necessity for thorough analysis. This focus illustrates the shallowness of W.S.A. ideology. More importantly it makes it very easy for proponents of W.S.A. ideology denounces as 'reactionary' anyone attempting to analyse W.S.A. ideology, or anyone not accepting the W.S.A. official line. It

is easier for one to accept the official line than to undertake a searching analysis; it saves one having to think.

Perhaps we are being severe on W.S.A. but it would be informative if they stated their position on a number of issues. These could then by analysed for their adherence to the philosophies of socialism and freedom. It is much more positive to analyse and present one's own beliefs than merely to focus on those of 'the enemy'. In particular we would like to know W.S.A.'s thoughts on the following:-

1) Authority relationships - does W.S.A. feel that it is necessary for society to be divided into leaders and followers following the revolution, even if society is in a transitional stage.

2) Family - does W.S.A. have any thoughts about the position of the family in a revolutionary society, and the demands of women's liberation.

3) Sexual behavior - in particular W.S.A.'s attitude to groups such as gay liberation, and to forms of sexual behavior often considered deviant in bourgeois societies.

4) Conscription - does W.S.A. oppose all conscription? It is not logically wrong for one to oppose conscription into capitalist armies and support conscription for people's armies, but such a position is incompatible with freedom.

We believe that a revolutionary philosophy must be consistent with the ideals of freedom and socialism.

THE POSSITIVITY OF ANARCHISM (1972)

There has been much criticism of the negative aspects of anarchism. So much so that anarchy is often used by bourgeois writers as a synonym for chaos. I consider such criticism legitimate only when it concerns our emphasis. Many previous Treasons have attacked existing social institutions while few have presented the anarchist alternatives. We do have an alternative, the only natural and desirable alternative - anarchy.

Anarchy is basically a philosophy based on libertarian self management and individualism, but I believe it to be more than a philosophy. It is a personal political position with definite aims and ideals; it does not claim to be the perfect solution to all of society's ills. It is in fact a system in which those ills, apart from those inherent in preceding systems, can be eradicated. This is because it is an organic and natural for the creativity of every individual to work for the good of the community. It is not a stifling environment, pretentious, and imposed, as are systems which are based on legality, authority and ultimately force.

Anarchist principles can be illustrated by examples increasingly relevant in the light of the growing inadequacies in modern capitalist society. The disgustingly inequitable distribution of wealth and stifling of initiative in industrial capitalism can be set against the principles of anarchist communism - A PROGRAM OF BREAD AND FREEDOM. The basis of anarchist communism is workers control. Direct workers control and ownership of industry. This means that the workers decide such things as production policies, environmental protection (the proleteriat saving its own environment as opposed to the insulated ruling classes deciding from country retreats on the basis of greed), working hours and wages on a basis of equality, and direct profit sharing within industry where profit remains. This would eliminate elitism, the industrial ruling class, and reduce the technocrat to a position of being an advisor. Distribution and prices would be contro-led by free producer-consumer co-operatives. All these factors would increase creativity and destroy enslaving slavocracy.

All these proposals form the basis of theroretical bolshevic communism, except one; they propose state ownership. This is the reason for the betrayal of the Russian revolution; state ownership leads to the accumulation of capital and thus the exploitation of labor. It also gives rise to bureaucracy and elitism which stifle creativity and freedom. In short, state capitalism, thus state oppression and exploitation. I do not propose state ownership or a party bureaucracy. I say and mean direct worker control. A much ignored sector of society when considering worker control is the agricultural one. Anarchist communism stands for the expropriation of all landlords. The land belongs to the people. Farming should be done on the basis of free communes established by the rural working class (a group denied existence by marxism) and controlled by direct participation of the class. This form of commune is now working effectively in India and Africa, and they did not grow out of the barrel of a gun. Free association of related interest groups such as the rural working class would work on similar principles to those proposed for the proletariat. Food production must never lie in the hands of exploiters. I have had personal experience with mutual aid in rural areas, it works because it is natural. Co-operation is as common in nature as competition.

Having explained the anarchist communist view of industry, agriculture and related problems we have partially dealt with the economic basis of exploitation and repression. There is however a closely related form of repression - "legality" and moral despotism To deal with these other tools of the ruling classes anarchist communism becomes superfluous. Traditional libertarian anarchism can do this adequately. (I should point out that their is no difference between anarchist communism and libertarian anarchism; it is the method of emphasis which I use to define my interests. Anarchist communism is prefoundly libertarian.)

The law is the basic tool of the exploiter; he uses it to subjugate the masses to suit his corrupt ends. A law is an act of violence. Behind every law stands a police force, behind which stands an army which draws its justification from a bullet. Laws to maintain individuality, and these are precious few, are inherent in and thus superfluous to an anarchist. Most laws are to protect true thieves, the accumulators of property, or are based on some perverted "moral" principle. A crime against property is a political act in a capitalist society and the lawmakers know it; they ought to, it is they who possess the inequitable wealth that forces such an act. Moral laws are conceived by perverted old ogres, notably churchmen, to satisfy frustrations which they accumulate as a result of a disgusting judeo-christian up-bringing. Anarchists recognize only the moral law of the right of the individual to self determination; this obviously must never impinge on another individual, for then you "break" the only anarchist "law".

Censorship is an indefensible infringement upon individual expression; its uses as a political weapon of the ruling class are diverse. "Obsenity" is a political act and is punished as such: Richard Neville got 18 months for a just attack on the values of a sick society, from a filthy old judge. "The opiate of the masses" - Marx is occasionally right and he has never been more so. Religion is a method by which the ignorance and thus the fear of the masses is used to rule them. The teachings of the primates (in every sense of the word) are lies based on lies. They teach meekness and humility towards ones "betters". What could be more suited to the needs of the despots. Science has shown the irrelevance of religion. God does not exist except as the ultimate in violent authoritarianism, which shows that if the best the ruling class can produce is an image then they are truly paper tigers. The anarchist proposes that "legality" and public morality serves only the interests of the boss state. The anarchist requires an end to property accumulation and moral persecution. The only law is that decided upon and concerning only the individual. In short anarchy as I see it stands for equality in all aspects of life and a natural right to individual self determination. The organisation of society without the use of political force, the rejection of power freaks and all forms of exploitation, anarchy means a symbiotic community of individuals.

THE RE-EMERGENCE OF OBSOLETE COMMUNISM (1972)

The re-emergence of all the old Maoists' philosophies in the last two years is a more disturbing event than any more blatant counter-revolutionary trend. That W.S.A., S.Y.A., etc., are counter-revolutionary is obvious from their dogma, organisation and activities.

They have dragged up all the antiquated shit that should have long ago been placed in its historical perspective, relevant to capitalism and society in C19th Europe. And even then it was corny.

The authoritarian vanguard-style of revolution, advocated by Marx and all the varieties evolving from him, have led to a consistent betrayal of popular uprisings. That the vanguard party become counter-revolutionary is obvious from a few examples.

The role of Lenin and Trotsky in post-revolutionary Russia was primarily to dismantle the workers' councils or soviets as autonomous bodies and to place them under the control of the Central Committee. These experiments in free self-management were working successfully in the factories and free rural collectives which were established in the Ukraine. The Bolsheviks systematically dismantled these until in 1921 workers and sailors in Petrograd revolted. Their demand - "All power to the Soviets". The very same demand the Bolsheviks fought for in 1917. Trotsky had them slaughtered. Immediately after the revolution much sexual repression in Russian society was swept away. By 1922 these advances had been renounced, laws against homosexuality and sexual freedom were re-introduced. In "revolutionary" China sexual repression and the authoritarian family structure are still a part of society. The link between sexual intolerance and a repressive state has often been made by people such as Wilhelm Reich.

The role of the communists in Spain '36 (homage to Catalona-Orwell) and France '68 (Obsolete Communism - Cohn-Bendit's) shows that in a revolutionary situation the vanguard party is always left behind by the masses.

The outdated analysis of modern society by the authoritarian left is evidence of their non-revolutionary nature.

The technological revolution has placed us in a position of post-scarcity capitalism. Yet the followers of the dead cling to their theories and the commiseration of the workers leading them to revolt. Modern industrial society has the capacity to supply the workers with the needs and the trash of modern living. In fact they have to, not only to placate them, but as consumers in a society of overabundance (I am talking about modern industrial societies, not the third world - distribution is as inequitable as ever). By ceding to the material demands of the labour movements, the capitalists have not only bought off their workers, but opened up new markets for their junk. So the basic flaw in capitalism is not materialism. When will the geriatric left realise that the basic contradiction in modern society, be it private or state capitalist, is in authority relationships.

The ruling elite cannot allow the people to participate in the control of society yet they cannot afford to alienate people from society. They are needed as producers, consumers and soldiers.

Until recently the only groups conscious of this were the syndicalist trade unions with their truly revolutionary demands for workers control.

Then suddenly we had the first generation reared in post-scarcity capitalism; their demands were not materialist, in fact many dropped out of consumerism, they wanted self-management, freedom. The young radicals catalysed a whole new movement for sanity. From this alienation of youth arose a new social phenomenon, the pre-revolutionary decomposition of classes. Young people across all classes marched in the streets with nothing to gain but freedom. This new revolutionary class, the proletariat, can often align with and catalyse the more alienated and deprived groups in conventional society. The classic example being the Paris '68 uprisings.

Yet for all these developments W.S.A. and S.Y.A. still mouth the decaying cliches of the '30's. These groups are a miserable cancer in the new rebellion, they threaten to stifle the flame of revolution with their antiquated authoritarianism. The sooner they are recognised as such and discarded for their irrelevance the better for the revolution.

1973: WHAT IS TO BE DONE? (1972)*

Since 1970 student involvement in radical politics has declined both in terms the percentage of the student body involved and in terms of the quality or intensity of their involvement. Furthermore the offensive strategy adopted in 1971 became in practice a defensive strategy accompanying a long drawn out defeat. This is true even though the desired admissions policy was adopted. (We do not speak of the resignation of Glenn because even if you believe, as we don't, that the occupations had anything much to do with his resignation, it is still no victory to replace a Glenn by a Smithers. In any case this was always called a 'symbolic' demand and, correspondingly, its achievement can only be a 'symbolic' victory. Its function, if any, is to conceal the fact that nothing has been done about the Council.)

Applying Marx's remarks on the recurrence of historical events, the pessimist might say that tactics are generally tried twice; the first time it is a tragedy and the second time a farce. Which brings up the question as to whether the same tactic of putting the left in a defensive position will be followed next year. That this tactic does not lead to 'great victories' is plain, it is also coming to be recognised that purely defensive struggles have no genuine radical content. The appeal, overt or implied, for student solidarity merely helps to keep the movement on what Lenin would have called a 'student union' level of consciousness.

That our 'marxist-leninists' are not Leninist is proven, above all else, by their theory that the revolutionary importance and radical content of any action is to be measured by the amount of repression it calls forth. Apply this theory to history and one discovers that reformist trade unions and minor pacifist religious sects have been immeasurably more revolutionary than any W.S.A. Apply it in Australia today and terrorism becomes the most radical form of action (and it probably always is on this test). Apply it to the university and you have the current situation.

Although it is strange for an anarchist to say it, the central problem with the various quasi-marxist groups around universities is that they are <u>insufficiently</u> Leninist. The maoists, whilst in theory they don't put students and ex-student lumpen-elements on the same footing as workers, still seem to suggest that students as a whole can form part of a revolutionary coalition with the working-class. Similarly behind the trotskyist idea of anti-war or self-managed universities lurks the idea that students may be able to pull off a french-style 'detonation'. Over all student groups hangs the ghost of 1968. Is this a realistic assessment of Australian students?

This concern with the student as such accompanies a blindness to the fact that the universities fairly successfully produce useful and respectable members of bourgeois society. The average life of a student in the student left is a small part of his total life and his average life in the left is probably not much longer. Assuming that a detonation is unlikely to occur (and there is no parallel to the French university situation) is the concentration on 'radicalisation' that important? There may be much more point in recruiting students for the particular skills they can offer and maintaining contact with them after they graduate. Student struggles are indeed important when they occur but is it the job of a revolutionary groups to create them? Radicalisation is not an end in itself and radicalisation without consolidation is just purposeless.

If there are changes in the university which would favour the left then we should work for them, but in order to achieve them and not in order to contrive a demonstration of the repressiveness of the authorities. If our aim is to oppose bourgeois ideology then the task should be taken seriously and not left to the ephemeral productions of illiterates who, as Togliatti put it, have not even raised themselves to the level of <u>bourgeois</u> culture.

* This article refers back to the earlier ones on La Trobe University politics.

<u>COMMUNITY ACTION - SELF MANAGEMENT CONFERENCE</u> (1972)

There are a number of radical groups working in the community at the present moment, such as the Working People's Assocation in Victoria, Secondary Students Unions, Gay Liberation, Anarchist and Self Management organisations, Rank and File Union Groups and various communal co-operatives.

A national conference has been organized for the weekend of the 25TH and 26TH of November at Camp Eureka to discuss further the ideas of community action brought out at an Anarchist conference held at Melbourne University in March this year. The feeling at this conference was that the movement for fundermental change has failed to invole itself in 'everyday life' and the issues which directly concern people, oppressive legal systems, strait jacket education, patronizing welfare, authoritarian family structure, sexual, racial, cultural, environmental oppression and bureaucracy in general.

The aims of the conference are to co-ordinate and to develop activity between a diversity of groups acting in this way.

We believe the way to combat the various forms of oppression outlined above is to develop the individuals self confidence and autonomy. Individuals must develop faith in their ability to organize themselves before there can be revolutionary change.

The emphasis will be on practical action such as:-

1. Claimants Unions

2. Community Media

3. Free Schools

4. Food Co-Operatives

5. Free Medical and Legal Advice

6. Lumpenproles Unions

7. Squatting, fighting housing commisions and organizing for direct action of all kinds.

Time will be available for general discussion of specific topics. Plenty of shelter, food will be available at cost price, but bring some to add to the communal pool. Bring your own utensils and sleeping gear - no electricity.

WORKERS CONTROL OR SELF-MANAGEMENT (1972)

Much of the literature produced for this conference* contains brief references to the term self-management. One session of the conference has been devoted to "Workers Control workers participation, self-management and socialism". It would seem then that the terms Workers Control and Self-Management represent two different things. They do in fact represent two different things, these differences have been the basis for much debate in the workers control movement in other countries. The aim of this pamphlet is to explain and the reasons why we support self-management. The booklet "Workers Councils - the Economics of a Self-Managed Society", available at the conference, explains, more fully than we wish to here, the concept of self-management.

Real workers control can only come about when the working class collectively take all the fundamental decisions in production. Not only in the individual factories but in relation to the entire economy. It must do this directly, through institutions of its own choice with which it can identify completely, which it can dominate completely. Such bodies are the workers councils. These councils are the historic creations of the working class, every time the question of power has been raised the workers have responded with these basic bodies. The Russian Factory Committees of 1917, the German Workers Councils of 1919, the Hungarian Councils of 1956 all express this pattern of self organization.

* 1972 Workers Control Conference in N.S.W.

With regard to the economy as a whole we see these councils federating nationally. They then bear on every aspect of the economy. This means the workers are not only controlling production but they are also taking initiatives and setting directions through bodies they can completely dominate. This is workers self-management of the economy. We use this term to differentiate between workers merely supervising, inspecting or checking decisions made by others and workers collectively initiating decisions in full knowledge of the relevant facts.

We also use the term self-management to seperate our idea of real workers control from those who see workers control merely as a tactic, to be discarded as unnecessary "after the revolution." Alternatively some see workers control as the workers ratifying and applying the decisions made by the "vanguard party of the working class" when it achieves state power. These formulations of workers control can only mean one thing for us, that the real control over the means of production will lie in the hands of a few. For us production cannot be managed by any agency other than the producers themselves. To us the basis of a class society is when the producers do not dominate the means of production. The question of real workers control versus a form of workers control which issubjugated to the 'vanguard party' or the trade unions has been posed many times in recent history. A classical example is the degeneration of the Russian revolution into a state capitalist bureaucracy. For us the decay began when the Bolsheviks began to emasculate the workers councils and factory committees, that is as early as 1918. Anytime a Leninist party proposes workers control it should be viewed with great suspicion for real workers control would make their organization redundant.

In all the literature surrounding this conference we have seen none which confronts the issue of state power. Obviously any form of workers control which alters the relationships within production in a meaningful way will require the destruction of the bourgeois state. The contentious point is the method of organization which we replace it with. Self-management means that the organ of the federated workers councils (perhaps a central assembly of delegates) tale over the management of the economy as a whole.

Many of those who have failed to raise the question of the state obviously feel that the 'party' will assume these functions. The entrenchment of any group in state power can only lead to bureaucratization and the weakening of the workers councils. The issue of state power must be raised and thrashed out now as it will determine much of the future of our movement.

One result of the points outlined above is our opposition to the proposal to be put to this conference to form a National Institute for Workers Control. We feel a national institute could too easily become removed from the realities of the rank and file move ment and that it would fall under the domination of ideological groups with vested interests. It would also be subject to overdue influence by the Sydney movement. The influence given to trade unions by the proposed institute could also undermine rank and file groups who come into conflict with the union bureaucracies. The alternative proposal to establish regional Workers Control Information Centres with workers control groups affiliated to them is one more in line with the needs and realities of the situation. This proposal will be circulated during the conference.

We must determine what workers control really means. To us it means the <u>workers</u> are <u>really</u> in control. That is workers self-management.

SELF-MANAGEMENT IN STRUGGLE.

SELF-MANAGEMENT IN SOCIETY.

Railway Workers Rank and File Group (Melbourne)

<u>STUDENT ACTIVISM: A RETURN TO THE MID-SIXTIES?</u> (1973)

'Student activism' is a term with a perfectly clear sense, habitually and wrongly used to cover the very different phenomena of student dissent and student revolts. It is misused in this way in order to trivialise the latter phenomena and also because it provides a reduction of these phenomena to the activities of the activists - a

reduction highly acceptable both to self-styled activists and their conservative opponents.

Student activism in the strict sense was a highly important fore-runner and contributor to the movements of anti-war dissent and revolt in Australia, the U.S.A. and (perhaps) some other countries. In the U.S.A. the student civil rights activists of the early sixties went on to form the politicised core of the early anti-war demonstrations and campus revolts. In Australia the same could be said of the students who constituted the various action movements around aboriginal rights, education, social welfare, nuclear warfare and conscription. A central feature of all these movements involving students in political missionary activity was that despite the fact that the bulk of the activists already held fairly developed social-democratic, communist or anarchist views their activity was not seen in any way as a challenge to the capitalist state. Student activism was legitimate protest.

Student dissent involved a shift in emphasis. (In passing one should note that anti-war dissent was not a purely student phenomenon as is evidenced, in their different ways, by the draft resistance movement and the moratoriums). In Australia the shift developed within the anti-conscription movement, on the one hand in the radical anti-conscriptionists move to draft resistance and on the other in the replacement of the anti-conscription by the anti-Vietnam theme. The former was the clearer break with the legitimate protest assumption but the latter was more important in changing an activist's organisation into a movement of dissent. Despite the continuity in the forms of protest the relationship to politics had changed. Activism aimed at changing government policies by acting on public opinion; it was tied to the textbook models of pluralist democracy and political influence. By contrast once the issue had become Vietnam and the American alliance the aim became to change the government (or, for a minority,to overthrow it). The anti-Vietnam movement was consciously oppositional and presented itself as such: this distinguished it from the earlier campaigns of activists. On the other hand its membership was less politically aware than that of its activist predecessors and predominantly lacked connections with organised left-wing politics. This was the milieu within which the various radical student movements developed. Whilst many leaders dated from the years of student activism the tone of these movements was set by the membership, the bulk of which had been politicised within the anti-war movement and had had no contact with the "old left" beyond rubbing shoulders with it at the larger meetings and demonstrations. Even so this minimal contact had some effect: Australian student maoism is pallid indeed by comparison with the exotic political growths produced in the U.S. student left's more complete isolation from a left political tradition.

Within purely student movements the logic of opposition could be developed to a higher level than it could in movements dominated by politicians and trades unionists aiming at Moratorium-style mass demonstrations. This development, in the student movement was favoured also by the synchronisation of Australian and U.S. anti-war activities which resulted in the importation, besides other things, of American analyses of the university - another baleful result of U.S. Cultural Imperialism. Organisations such as SDS and SDA imported, together with their names, the American concept of the "System", and of the University as a key part of it. (It is perhaps unfair to criticise SDA for "Americanism" since Queensland political conditions admit of U.S. analogies). At the time the emphasis was individualist and moralistic: "Don't get caught in the System"; "Work hard, study hard, get ahead, Kill!" are two characteristic slogans of the period. For the early Americanisers the student was morally suspect; someone who might well collaborate with the university and hence the system. It was some years before the idea was fully accepted that there was a necessary conflict between the interests of students and of the university and even then it was only accepted within the conceptual mythology of student anti-imperialism in which the university became the local avatar of U.S. Imperialism and the student a third world peasant by virtue of his political sympathies. This metaphysical twist to what in the U.S. was a quite concrete idea can perhaps be traced to the lack of Australian universities(except the ANU)pursuing military-political research for the US and the lack of close links (except for Sir Phillip Baxter) between university governing bodies and agencies using or producing such research.

It would appear that we are currently passing out of the period of student dissent. The decline in anti-war activity means that the political socialisation of new members more nearly resembles that of eight years ago than five and those who entered

the movement through the anti-Vietnam demonstrations are now much more politically sophisticated. Increasingly student radical organisations are diversifying to become multi-issue activist groups. Despite the remaining anti-imperialist rhetoric the student movements are now working on the same assumptions as before the rise of anti-war dissent. The issues are almost exactly the same as those that concerned activists in the early and mid-sixties and despite the clearly capitalist orientation of the A.L.P. in office no one in the student movement could support the alternative. Protest politics must be directed towards influencing the government, especially if you are opposed to the opposition.

This shift back to student activism and its implicit assumptions will entail changes in the style and organisation of student politics. Official student bodies, A.U.S. and the S.R.C.'s, are liable to become more important as organising focii and the irrelevance of university occupations to most of the policy issues of student activism will tend to erase the distinction between these official bodies and the student radical organisations. This latter tendency has become apparent in the last year at La Trobe; student maoism as a distinct phenomenon seems to be dying in its former heartlands.

The decline of organisations having university occupations as their raison d'etre does not mean the end of student revolts. Despite the dependence of most university revolts on the general mood of student dissent the best occupations and strikes of the last five years were those arising more or less spontaneously from issues rather than those which were contrived by radical organisations on some pretext or other. The quite unprecedented Sydney Arts Faculty Strike over the women's course this year shows the size of the movements that can arise from the pursuit of concrete objectives for their own sake. Rather than such events decreasing in frequency one might imagine that such conflicts between antiquated university political structures and personages and younger and radical staff will increase as the anti-war generation moves into academic positions.

In the above my topic has been the similarities between trends today and the mid-sixties. There are also differences. The crucial one would seem to be that of the external political affiliations of student activists. Instead of an A.L.P. in opposition we now have an A.L.P. in power; this will pose questions for those activists, probably still the majority, who are of a social-democratic inclination. Further left the situation is even more interesting. Before the anti-Vietnam movement started the C.P.A. and (in Sydney) the trotskyists were the only left groups of any student following. Today the situation is quite different. There are still trotskyists but there are now three "communist" parties none of which is quite what the C.P.A. used to be. Of the three the influence of the Moscow party remains low whilst the influence of the new C.P.A. seems to be increasing. (Not that it can expect to have much influence; most activists will probably remain non-party). One consequence of this "pluralism" on the left is that it has to some extent opened the trade union movement to students and various joint ventures of students and workers are now planned or underway in the organisation of rank and file groups and trade union education. There has also been much closer contact and co-operation between student movements and trade union bodies than in the sixties.

The historical significance of student activism of the sixties was that it was the training ground for the first cadres of the anti-war movement. Whether student activism in the seventies will feature as a footnote to the Vietnam war or will have independent importance cannot now be predicted. It depends on future political developments.